

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 102

HE 015 341

TITLE Outcomes Assessment--A New Era in Accreditation. The Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (93rd, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 5-7, 1979).

INSTITUTION Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Philadelphia, PA.

PUB DATE 80

NOTE 102p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Accreditation (Institutions); *Aptitude Tests; College Admission; College Entrance Examinations; College Graduates; College Students; *Educational Assessment; Educational Benefits; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; *Outcomes of Education; Professional Associations; Scores; Student Development; Student Evaluation; Testing

IDENTIFIERS Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools; *Scholastic Aptitude Test

ABSTRACT

Proceedings are presented of the 1979 meeting of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, which includes speeches on outcomes assessment along with the business meeting of the Association. In the keynote address, "Outcomes Assessment--A New Era in Accreditation," Howard R. Bowen identifies goals an educational institution would likely try to achieve: cognitive development of students; aesthetic sensibility; emotional and moral development; practical competence in citizenship, work, and family life; and direct satisfactions and enjoyment from education during the school and college years as well as in later life. He suggests principles that might be followed in the identification and evaluation of outcomes, including: assessment could be linked to all the major goals of education and not confined to those that are easily testable or that relate to finances; outcomes assessment should be based on the study of alumni as well as students; and an outcomes assessment could be concerned with change in students as a result of their educational experience. Additional speeches are as follows: "From the Depression to the Revolution" (Abraham H. Lass); "Testing the Test--A New Era in Assessment" (George H. Hanford); and "Assembly of Elementary Schools" (Barbara R. Frey). Additional contents include the following: reports of the officers and commissions of the association; the charter and by-laws of the association; the program of the meeting; and a list of the officers, board of trustees, commission members, honorary members, committees, and delegates. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED222102

THE PROCEEDINGS

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools
93rd Annual Convention, December 5-December 7, 1979
Fairmont Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Outcomes Assessment— A New Era in Accreditation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Middle States
Association of Colleges and
Schools -*
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION 1980

HE 015-341

CONTENTS

Officers of the Association	4
Board of Trustees	4
Commission on Secondary Schools	5
Commission on Higher Education	6
Assembly of Elementary Schools	7
Honorary Members	8
Committees and Delegates	8
Program of the 93rd Annual Meeting	10
Keynote Session: Howard R. Bowen	27
Business Meeting of the Association	39
Report of the President	33
Report of the Treasurer	41
Auditor's Report	42
Report of the Executive Director	47
Report of the Commission on Secondary Schools	49
Summary of Action by the Commission on Secondary Schools	51
Report of the Commission on Higher Education	52
Summary of Action by the Commission on Higher Education	54
Report of the Assembly of Elementary Schools	56
Summary of Action by the Assembly of Elementary Schools	58
Report of the Committee on School and College Relations	61
Report of the Nominating Committee	62
Remarks of the President-Elect	63
Luncheon Address: Abraham H. Lass	65
General Session Address: George H. Hanford	74
Breakfast Address: Barbara R. Frey	80
Charter of the Association	84
By-Laws of the Association	86

MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS
DECEMBER 7, 1979 — DECEMBER 13, 1980

OFFICERS

President: J. HARRISON MORSON

Dean of Student Affairs, Union College, Cranford, New Jersey

First Vice President: MSGR. FRANCIS B. SCHULTE, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Philadelphia

Second Vice President: JAMES S. SMOOT

Vice Chancellor for Educational Services, State University of New York, Albany

Treasurer: JOHN F. ZELLER III

Vice President for Administration and Finance, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

Immediate Past President: JOSEPH P. SABO

Superintendent, Watchung Hills Regional High School District, Warren, New Jersey

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

ROLLIN P. BALDWIN (1982), President, The Baldwin Schools, New York City and Puerto Rico

MILTON G. BASSIN, Chairperson of the Commission on Higher Education, *ex officio*

ELIZABETH E. BOHNING (1980), Professor of Languages and Literature, University of Delaware, Newark

THOMAS J. BRADSHAW, Chairperson of the Commission on Secondary Schools, *ex officio*

GLORIA H. CANEGATA (1980), District Superintendent of Education, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands

RHODA M. DORSEY, First Vice Chairperson of the Commission on Higher Education, *ex officio*

JOHN C. DUNLAP (1981), Superintendent of Schools, Susquehanna Township District, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

ELINOR R. FORD (1981), Professor of Educational Policy and Administration, Fordham University at Lincoln Center, New York City

BARBARA R. FREY (1982), Vice President for Academic Affairs, State University College at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York

ODETTE D. HARRIS, Vice Chairperson of the Commission on Secondary Schools, *ex officio*

C. WILLIAM HUNTLEY (1980), Provost, Union College, Schenectady, New York

ARCHIE R. JORDAN (1980), Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, Caesar Rodney School District, Camden, Delaware

ALLAN A. KUUSISTO (1982), President, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, New York

WILLIAM L. MOBRAATEN (1980), President, Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania; President, Diamond State Telephone Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, public member

MARGARET L. MURRAY (1982), Principal, Langley Junior High School, Washington, D.C.

JERRY C. OLSON (1982), Superintendent, Pittsburgh Public Schools, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

REV. JOHN OWENS (1981), Headmaster, Saint James School, Saint James, Maryland

PETER N. PERRETTI, JR. (1980), Attorney, Riker, Danzig, Scherer & Debevoise, Newark, New Jersey, public member

MEYER P. POTAMKIN (1980), President, Boulevard Mortgage Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, public member

MARVIN WACHMAN (1980), President, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, *ex officio*

CALVIN L. CRAWFORD: Executive Director
Middle States Association, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BEATRICE WARDLOW: Business Manager

COURTS OULAHAN: General Counsel, Washington, D.C.

COMMISSION ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS

THOMAS J. BRADSHAW (1980), Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Personnel Service, Edison Township Public Schools, Edison, New Jersey, Chairperson of the Commission

CLAUDE C. CASEY, JR. (1981), Headmaster, St. Paul's School, Garden City, New York

W. BYRON FORBUSH (1980), Headmaster, Friends School, Baltimore, Maryland

CLAY E. GIVLER (1981), Principal, York County Vocational-Technical School, York, Pennsylvania

CHARLES GUNNER (1981), Principal, Bethlehem Central High School, Delmar, New York

SISTER MARY BERCHMANS HANNAN (1982), Principal, Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School, Washington, D.C.

ODETTE D. HARRIS (1982), Principal, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Vice Chairperson of the Commission

JACK H. HARRISON (1981), Headmaster, American School in London, England

EARL R. KNORR (1981), Principal, Springfield High School, Springfield, Pennsylvania

ROBERT H. McBRIDE (1980), Manager of Business Analysis, E. I. DuPont de Nemours and Company, Wilmington, Delaware, public member

WILLIAM R. MILLER (1981), Principal, Warren Area High School, Warren, Pennsylvania

J. HARRISON MORSON, President of the Association, *ex officio*

BROTHER FRANCIS M. OUELLETTE, SM (1981), Superintendent of Catholic Schools, Archdiocese of San Juan, Puerto Rico

MARIE P. PARNELL (1982), Principal, Sayreville War Memorial High School, Parlin, New Jersey

MSGR. FRANCIS B. SCHULTE, First Vice President of the Association, *ex officio*

W. CECIL SHORT (1982), Principal, McDonough Senior High School, Waldorf, Maryland

JAMES S. SMOOT, Second Vice President of the Association, *ex officio*

REV. MSGR. FRANCIS J. TAYLOR (1981), Vicar for Education and Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

FRANK W. THOMAS (1982), Principal, Blue Mountain Middle School, Peekskill, New York

MARY FRANCES WAGLEY (1981), Headmistress (retired), St. Paul's School for Girls, Brooklandville, Maryland, public member

WILLIAM H. ETSWEILER, JR., Executive Director, Commission on Secondary Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

FREDERICK AHO, Associate Director

CARL F. HENSINGER, Associate Director

JOHN L. DIXEY, Associate Director

R. KENNETH PIERCE, Associate Director

COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

NANCY N. ARCHER (1982), Manager, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Company, New York City

MILTON G. BASSIN (1980), President, York College of the City University of New York, Chairperson of the Commission

ETHEL RIOS de BETANCOURT (1980), Professor of Humanities, Faculty of General Studies, Rio Piedras Campus, University of Puerto Rico

ALLEN T. BONNELL (1981), President, Community College of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

WALTON A. BROWN (1982), President, State University of New York Agricultural and Technical College, Cobleskill, New York

WILLIAM H. BROWN, III (1982), Schnader, Harrison, Segal & Lewis, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, public member

RICHARD D. CHALLENGER (1981), Professor of History, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

ROSE M. CHANNING (1981), President, Middlesex County College, Edison, New Jersey

WESTON L. DEAN (1982), Principal, Loch Raven Senior High School, Baltimore, Maryland

G. BRUCE DEARING (1980), University Professor of Humanities, SUNY Upstate Medical Center, Syracuse, New York

ROBERT J. DeVALUE (1980), Director of Business and Auxiliary Services, Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey

DAVID W. D. DICKSON (1980), President, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, New Jersey

RHODA M. DORSEY (1981), President, Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland, First Vice Chairperson of the Commission

EDWARD V. ELLIS (1981), Associate Dean for Continuing Education Commonwealth Campuses, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania

MARGARET M. HEALY (1980), Treasurer, Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania

HELEN MURRAY KLEYLE (1981), Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

EILFEN KUHNS (1981), Coordinator and Associate Professor, Education Administration Program, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.

COLETTE MAHONEY, RSHM (1982), President, Marymount Manhattan College, New York

CHRISTINE J. MOORE (1980), Dean for Admissions/Registration, Community College of Baltimore, Maryland

J. HARRISON MORSON, President of the Association, *ex officio*

MSGR. FRANCIS B. SCHULTE, First Vice President of the Association, *ex officio*

JAMES S. SMOOT, Second Vice President of the Association, *ex officio*

E. ARTHUR TRABANT (1982), President, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware

J. L. ZWINGLE (1982), President Emeritus, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C., public member

ROBERT KIRKWOOD, Executive Director, Commission on Higher Education, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

HOWARD L. SIMMONS, Associate Director

DOROTHY P. HEINDEL, Administrative Secretary

ASSEMBLY OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS — EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

H. WESTCOTT CUNNINGHAM, Headmaster, The Pingry Schools, Elizabeth, New Jersey

ELINOR R. FORD, Professor of Educational Policy and Administration, Fordham University at Lincoln Center, New York City

BARBARA R. FREY, Vice President for Academic Affairs, State University College at Buffalo, New York

WILLIAM L. MOBRAATEN, President, Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania; President, Diamond State Telephone Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

MSGR. FRANCIS B. SCHULTE, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Philadelphia

FRANK W. THOMAS, Principal, Blue Mountain Middle School, Peekskill, New York

MSGR. JAMES R. TRACY, Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Camden, New Jersey

JOHN A. STOOPS, Assembly Director, Institute for Educational Studies and Evaluation, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

HONORARY MEMBERS

Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

MARGARET T. CORWIN
GENE D. GISBURNE
GALEN JONES

ELWOOD C. KASTNER
OLIVER W. MELCHOIR
EWALD B. NYQUIST

Commission on Secondary Schools

R. D. MATTHEWS

Commission on Higher Education

MARGARET T. CORWIN
MILLARD E. GLADFELTER
ALBERT E. MEDER, JR.

EWALD B. NYQUIST
FRANK P. PISKOR
E. KENNETH SMILEY

COMMITTEES AND DELEGATES

Representatives to College Entrance Examination Board

CALVIN L. CRAWFORD, Executive Director, Middle States Association, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

J. HARRISON MORSON, Dean of Student Affairs, Union College, Cranford, New Jersey

Representatives to the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

MILTON G. BASSIN, President, York College of the City University of New York, Jamaica, New York

G. BRUCE DEARING, University Professor of Humanities, SUNY Upstate Medical Center, Syracuse, New York

Finance Committee

JOHN F. ZELLER III, Vice President for Administration and Finance; General Counsel, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania; Chairperson of the Committee

ELIZABETH E. BOHNING, Professor of Languages and Literature, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware

ROBERT J. DeVALUE, Director of Business and Auxiliary Services, Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey

JOHN C. DUNLAP, Superintendent of Schools, Susquehanna Township District, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

ROBERT H. McBRIDE, Manager of Business Analysis, E. I. DuPont Company, Wilmington, Delaware

PHILLIPS SMITH, Headmaster, Trinity Pawling School, Pawling, New York

MARVIN WACHMAN, President, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Representatives on National Study of School Evaluation

ROLLIN P. BALDWIN, President, The Baldwin Schools, New York City and Puerto Rico

PAUL R. BINGAMAN, Principal, State College Area High School, State College, PA

WILLIAM H. ETSWEILER, JR., Executive Director, Middle States Commission on Secondary Schools

THOMAS J. BRADSHAW, Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Personnel Service, Edison Township Public Schools, Edison, New Jersey

JOHN A. STOOPS, Director, Institute for Educational Studies and Evaluation, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania; Director, Middle States Assembly of Elementary Schools

Committee on School and College Relations

MARGARET BOL, Guidance Counselor, Montgomery High School, Skillman, New Jersey

EDWIN T. CARINE, Senior Associate, The College Board, New York City

SISTER MARY BERCHMANS HANNAN, Principal, Georgetown Visitation Preparatory School, Washington, D.C.

MARGARET M. HEALY, Treasurer, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania

SALLY HIGGINS, Guidance Director, Seaford High School, Seaford, Delaware; Chairperson of the Committee

JOSEPH KLEGMAN, Chairman, Board of Trustees, Middlesex County College, Edison, New Jersey, Vice Chairperson of the Committee

BROTHER WALTER KRAMAR, Principal, Bishop McNamara High School, Forestville, Maryland

ROBERT McLAUGHLIN, President, Herkimer County Community College, Herkimer, New York

GLORIA MAHORNEY, Director of Admissions, Van Ness Campus, University of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

DAVID MIRSKY, Special Assistant to the President, Yeshiva University, New York, New York

CHRISTINE J. MOORE, Dean for Admissions Registration, Community College of Baltimore, Baltimore, Maryland

JOHN MOSER, Director of Admissions, Grove City College, Grove City, Pennsylvania

JANE SHARAF, Headmistress, Solebury School, New Hope, Pennsylvania

JACQUELINE SNOW, Dean of Student Development, Camden County College, Blackwood, New Jersey

EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS, *ex officio*

PROGRAM OF THE MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5

12:00 Noon - 6:00 p.m.	Registration	Ballroom Floor
1:30 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.	Opening Ceremonies: Concert by the Symphonic Orchestra of the Philadelphia College of the Performing Arts	Ballroom
	Roman Carnival Overture	Berlioz
	Symphony in D minor	Franck
	I. Lento — Allegro-non troppo	
	II. Allegretto	
	III. Allegro-non troppo	
	Conductor: Joseph Primavera	
2:30 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.	Keynote Address: Outcomes Assessment — A New Era in Accreditation	Ballroom
	Presiding: Joseph P. Sabo , Superintendent, Watchung Hills Regional High School District, Warren, New Jersey; President of the Association	
	Keynote Speaker: Howard R. Bowen , Avery Professor of Economics and Education, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California	
3:15 p.m. - 3:25 p.m.	Introduction of the Convention Program	Ballroom
	Presenter: Joseph P. Sabo , President of the Association	

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Higher Education: The Financial Measures Project Clover-Red Rooms

As accreditation increasingly emphasizes the importance of institutional finances, the need for new tools of financial analysis to use in the self-study and evaluation process becomes increasingly important. This session will provide an opportunity for a discussion of some of those new tools.

Presiding: **Margaret M. Healy**, Treasurer, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania

Speaker: **Nathan Dickmeyer**, Director, Financial Measures Project, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Secondary Education: Evaluation and Accreditation — The Process Interpreted

School delegates will meet in four sub-groups with a staff member of the Commission on Secondary Schools. These sessions follow the alignment of staff assignments and delegates will have an opportunity to share views with the individual responsible for the development of evaluation team rosters, the initial analysis and review of evaluation team reports and matters directly related to the delegates' own schools. Joining the staff will be members of the Commission and the respective State Advisory Committees.

Group A: Public Schools in the District of Columbia, Delaware, New Jersey and Philadelphia; all schools in Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and Overseas Crystal Room

Presiding: **Frederick Aho**, Associate Director of the Commission on Secondary Schools

Group B: Public Schools in Pennsylvania exclusive of the following counties: Crawford, Erie, Fayette, Greene, Philadelphia, Warren and Washington Tecumseh Room

Presiding: **Carl F. Hensinger**, Associate Director of the Commission on Secondary Schools

Group C: Public Schools in Maryland, New York, plus the following Pennsylvania counties:
Crawford, Erie, Fayette, Greene, Warren and Washington Pink Room

Presiding: **R. Kenneth Pierce**, Associate Director of the Commission on Secondary Schools

Group D: Non-public Schools exclusive of Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and
Overseas Poor Richard Room

Presiding: **John L. Dixey**, Associate Director of the Commission on Secondary Schools

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Elementary Education: Workshops

A series of workshops on several aspects of the elementary school evaluation protocol.

Group A: Workshop for Prospective Members of Elementary School Visiting
Teams Terrace Room

Presenters: **Wayne D. Black**, Principal, Rockwood (Pennsylvania) Elementary Schools

Sister Mary Montgomery, O.P., Director of Elementary Education, Archdiocese of Baltimore

Group B: Workshop on the Development of the Action Plan Skyline Room

Presenters: **Harriett De Long**, Teacher, Pingry Lower School, Short Hills, New Jersey

Sister Helen Wiegmann, Principal, Norwood-Fontbonne Academy, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Group C: Workshop for Prospective Chairpersons of Elementary School Evaluation Teams
..... Blue Room

Presenters: **Patricia Craven**, Supervisor of Reading, Area Four of the New Castle County
(Delaware) Schools

H. Wescott Cunningham, Headmaster Pingry School, Hillside, New Jersey

5:30 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.

Social Hour — Cash Bar Ballroom

7:00 p.m.

Free Evening

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6

7:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Registration Ballroom Floor

7:30 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.

Continental Breakfast Ballroom and Balcony Foyers

For those delegates whose breakfast needs are relatively simple or whose schedules prevent more elaborate arrangements, coffee and danish will be available in the area adjacent to the ballroom.

7:30 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.

Continental Breakfast: Non-Public School Delegates Crystal Room

Co-Hosts: **John L. Dixey**, Associate Director, Middle States Commission on Secondary Schools

Sarah Donnelly, Executive Director, Association of Independent Maryland Schools

Stephen Hinrichs, Executive Director, New York State Association of Independent Schools

Brother John Olsen, C.F.X., Executive Director, Secondary School Department, National Catholic Educational Association

Sister Carleen Reck, S.S.N.D., Executive Director, Elementary School Department, National Catholic Educational Association

John A. Stoops, Director, Middle States Assembly of Elementary Schools

9:00 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.

Business Meeting of the Association Ballroom

Presiding: **Joseph P. Sabo**, President of the Association

Parliamentarian: **John F. Budway**, Administrative Assistant to the Dean, St. John's College of St. John's University, New York

Reports: See Agenda distributed with registration materials.

10:30 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.

Elementary Education: The Steering Committee in Self-Study Activity

The Steering Committee is the governing board for the self-study, the evaluation by the visiting team and the creation of the action plan. These workshops will focus on the first of the responsibilities: the appointment of sub-committees, the establishment of the time line and arrangements for the visiting team.

Group A: The Steering Committee in Single Elementary School
Situations

Tecumseh Room

Presenters: **Rudolph H. Deetjen, Jr.**, Headmaster, The Peck School, Morristown, New Jersey

Diane Madara, Teacher, St. George School, Erie, Pennsylvania

Norman Lemcke, Dean of Studies, The Peck School, Morristown, New Jersey

Group B: The Steering Committee in Multi-Elementary School

Situations Red Room

Presenters: **Geraldine Kenny**, Teacher, Brooklyn Avenue School, Valley Stream, New York

Alice Wood, Kindergarten Teacher, Lynnewood Elementary School, Havertown, Pennsylvania

Joseph Zavarella, Principal, Furnace Works Elementary School, Peekskill, New York

10:30 a.m. - 11:45 p.m.

Secondary Education: Outcomes Assessment — Regional Accreditation and the State Mandate

Representatives of several State Departments of Education together with school and school association delegates will discuss the relationship between governmental and non-governmental agencies; their impact on each other and on the constituencies they each seek to serve.

Group: Independent, Private and Church Related Schools Crystal Room

Presiding: **Walter Burgin, Jr.**, Headmaster, Mercersburg (Pennsylvania) Academy

Panelists: **Rev. James T. O'Brien**, Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Syracuse, New York

Walter McCarthy, Director of Curriculum Services to Private Schools, New Jersey State Education Department, Trenton

Stephen Hinrichs, Executive Director, New York State Association of Independent Schools, Pittsford, New York

Sarah Donnelly, Executive Director, Association of Independent Maryland Schools, Baltimore

Group B: Public Schools North Cameo Room

Presiding: **Odette Harris**, Principal, William Penn High School, Philadelphia; Vice
Chairperson of the Commission on Secondary Schools

Panelists: **Albert F. Merz**, Chief, Bureau of Secondary School Supervision, New York State
Education Department, Albany

William Volk, State Coordinator of T & E, New Jersey State Department of Education, Trenton

Donald L. Clark, Director, Bureau of School Improvement, Department of Education,
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

10:30 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.

Higher Education: Open Forum of the Commission on Higher Education Clover Room

This annual session permits the representatives of the Commission's constituents to meet in
open forum with members of the Commission and its staff to discuss mutual interests and
concerns.

Presiding: **Milton G. Bassin**, President, York College of the City University of New York;
Chairperson of the Commission on Higher Education

12:00 Noon - 1:45 p.m.

Luncheon and Address: From the Depression to the Revolution Ballroom
(Luncheon tickets will be collected at the table)

Presiding: **Joseph P. Sabo**, President of the Association

Invocation: **Msgr. James R. Tracy**, Superintendent, Diocese of Camden (New Jersey) Schools;
Member of the Executive Committee of the Assembly of Elementary Schools

Introduction of Speaker: **Michael J. Reynolds**, Assistant Vice Chancellor for University
Planning, State University of New York; Chairperson of the Association's Committee on
School and College Relations.

The speaker will assess education outcomes from the perspective of twenty years as a New York City high school principal during the 50's and 60's: The way it was, the way it is and the way it is supposed to be. Described in a recent issue of *The College Board Review* as the last of the red-hot principals, Abe Lass would salvage a part of the past as an antidote for current educational ills.

Speaker: **Abraham H. Lass**

2:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

Higher Education: Current Developments in Outcomes Measurement . . North Cameo Room

Three of the leading experts in outcomes assessment will report on the current state of the art. (Panel repeated at 3:30 p.m.)

Presiding: **Rhoda M. Dorsey**, President, Goucher College, Towson, Maryland

Panelists: **Aubrey Forrest**, Director, College Outcome Measures Project, American College Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa

Sydney Micek, Senior Staff Associate, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Boulder, Colorado

Eldon Park, Director, Institutional Research Program for Higher Education, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

2:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

Higher Education: Institutional Experiences with Outcomes Studies . . South Cameo Room

Reports on what a few institutions are doing in the way of outcomes studies and a look at one major retrospective study. (Panel repeated at 3:30 p.m.)

Presiding: **Rose Channing**, President, Middlesex County College, Edison, New Jersey

Panelists: **Martha Church**, President, Hood College, Frederick, Maryland

D. James Donald, Coordinator of Career Education, Delaware County Community College, Media, Pennsylvania

Roy Heath, Psychologist and Author of *Princeton Retrospectives — Twenty-fifth-year Reflections on a College Education*

2:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

School and College Relations: Outcomes Assessment —
Better Information About Students

Crystal Room

How can high schools and colleges participate jointly in accumulating more accurate information about their students? How can information collected about students bring about academic program and student service changes? What alternatives are there to information collection by survey and questionnaire? The use of the College Board's Admissions Testing Program as a management information system.

Presiding: **Jack Guildroy**, Head Counselor (Retired), John L. Miller Great Neck North High School, Great Neck, New York

Panelists: **Thomas Flynn**, Vice President for Student Affairs, Monroe Community College, Rochester, New York

Carol P. Halstead, Acting Vice President for Public Affairs, The College Board, New York City

Patrick J. Hill, Professor of Philosophy and Director of the Federated Learning Communities, State University of New York at Stony Brook

2:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

Secondary Education: Assessment Instruments and their Role in Outcomes Assessment in the 1980's Clover Room

A review of assessment instruments currently available for or in secondary schools. (Followed by panel on institutional applications at 3:30 p.m.)

Presiding: **Thomas Bradshaw**, Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Personnel Service, Edison Township Public Schools, Edison, New Jersey; Chairperson, Commission on Secondary Schools

Speaker: **Donald C. Manlove**, Executive Secretary, National Study of School Evaluation, Bloomington, Indiana

2:00 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

Elementary Education: The Development and Writing of the Self-Study Report Rose Garden

Presenter: **Ellnor R. Ford**, Professor of Educational Policy and Administration, Fordham University, New York City; Chairperson of the Governing Board of the Assembly of Elementary Schools

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Higher Education: Current Developments in Outcomes Measurement ... North Cameo Room

Three of the leading experts in outcomes assessment will report on the current state of the art (Repeat of 2:00 p.m. panel)

Presiding: **Christine J. Moore**, Dean for Admissions/Registration, Community College of Baltimore

Panelists: **Aubrey Forrest**, Director, College Outcome Measures Project, American College Testing Program, Iowa City, Iowa

Sidney Micek, Senior Staff Associate, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, Boulder, Colorado

Eldon Park, Director, Institutional Research Program for Higher Education, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Higher Education: Institutional Experiences with Outcomes Studies . . . South Cameo Room

Reports on what a few institutions are doing in the way of outcome studies and a look at one major retrospective study. (Repeat of 2:00 p.m. panel)

Presiding: **Michael J. Reynolds**, Assistant Vice Chancellor for University Planning State University of New York, Albany

Panelists: **Martha Church**, President, Hood College, Frederick, Maryland

D. James Donald, Coordinator of Career Education, Delaware County Community College, Media, Pennsylvania

Roy Heath, Psychologist and Author of *Princeton Retrospectives* — *Twenty-fifth-year Reflections on a College Education*

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

School and College Relations: Outcomes Assessment —

Better Information for Students Crystal Room

What do students and administrators regard as their most important information needs? How can students produce quality materials for other students? Full disclosure as a response to student consumerism; how should it be promoted? What is the role of government and what regulatory measures and guidelines are already in effect?

Presiding: **Jack Guildroy**, Head Counselor (Retired) John L. Miller Great Neck North High School, Great Neck, New York

Panelists: **Thomas Flynn**, Vice President for Student Affairs, Monroe Community College, Rochester, New York

Carol P. Halstead, Acting Vice President for Public Affairs, The College Board, New York City

Kathryn Beron, Project Director, Better Information Project: Prizes in Education, National Student Educational Fund, Washington, D.C.

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Secondary Education: Assessment Instruments and Their Role
in Outcomes Assessment in the 1980's Clover Room

Comments from member schools on the application of assessment instruments currently available for use in secondary schools. (A continuation of the 2:00 p.m. panel.)

Presiding: **Thomas Bradshaw**, Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Personnel Service, Edison Township Public Schools, Edison, New Jersey; Chairperson, Commission on Secondary Schools

Panelists: **John H. Wright, Jr.**, Headmaster, Gill/St. Bernard's School, Bernardsville, New Jersey

Glenn E. Grube, Principal, Bergenfield High School, Bergenfield, New Jersey

Wayne Von Stetten, Principal, Brandywine High School, Wilmington, Delaware

Rev. Msgr. Francis J. Taylor, Vicar for Education and Superintendent of Schools, Diocese of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Elementary Education: Evaluation, Certification and Accreditation
of Elementary Schools Rose Garden

Presenter: **John A. Stoops**, Director of the Assembly of Elementary Schools

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7

8:00 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.

Registration Ballroom Floor

8:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.

Continental Breakfast Ballroom Foyer

Coffee and danish will again be available in the foyer area adjacent to the ballroom.

8:00 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.

Elementary Education: Breakfast Meeting Rose Garden

Presiding: **Ellnor R. Ford**, Professor of Educational Policy and Administration, Fordham University, New York City; Chairperson Governing Board of the Assembly of Elementary Schools

Speaker: **Barbara R. Frey**, Vice President for Academic Affairs, State University College of Arts and Sciences, Buffalo, New York

9:15 a.m. - 10:15 a.m.

General Session: Testing the Tests — A New Era in Assessment Ballroom

Presiding: **Joseph P. Sabo**, President of the Association

Speaker: **George H. Hanford**, President, The College Board, New York City

During the past year state legislatures in California, Texas, Colorado, Ohio, Florida, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and New York have introduced bills designed to regulate standardized admissions tests.

Most of these bills would require the publication of test questions and answers shortly after the test is given, thereby destroying the security of each test form and making reuse impossible.

Some of the issues raised by legislation aimed at government regulation of admissions testing are: Is legislation necessary to make testing agencies accountable? Without legislation could students, parents and teachers find out the nature, purposes and uses of the tests? Will the educational or public interest benefits anticipated by supporters of legislation be realized?

10:30 a.m. - 12:00 Noon

Secondary Education: Outcomes Assessment through Self-Study and Evaluation

Panels will discuss how outcomes assessment may be and should be related to the Middle States approach to self-study and evaluation. The role of the committee visit, the chairperson's report and post-evaluation activities. A review of successful practices developed in response to self-study and evaluation recommendations.

Group A: Public Schools South Cameo Room

Presiding: **Clay Givler**, Principal, York County Vocational-Technical School, York, Pennsylvania; Member, Executive Committee of the Commission on Secondary Schools

Panelists: **William Redfern**, Principal, Ridley Senior High School, Folsom, Pennsylvania

Weston L. Dean, Principal, Loch Raven Senior High School, Baltimore, Maryland

Robert H. McBride, Manager of Business Analysis, E. I. duPont and Company, Wilmington, Delaware; Public Member of the Commission on Secondary Schools

Roy E. Holland, Principal, Glassboro High School, Glassboro, New Jersey

Group B: Independent, Private and Church Related Schools Crystal Room

Presiding: **Rev. Thomas McDade**, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Newark, New Jersey

Panelists: **Brother Gary Eck**, Principal, Chaminade High School — Boys, Mineola, New York

Raymond Oram, Assistant Headmaster, The Peddie School, Hightstown, New Jersey

Ronald R. Russo, Principal, St. Mark's High School, Wilmington, Delaware

Sister Dorothy Arthur, S.S.N., Principal, Archbishop Keough High School, Baltimore, Maryland

James E. Achterberg, Headmaster, Abington Friends School, Jenkintown, Pennsylvania

10.30 a.m. - 12.00 Noon

Higher Education: The Decision-Making Process:

Who's in Charge? Clover Room

A review of the Wilson and Mannes College cases where external authorities have superseded Boards of Trustees and imposed their own decisions.

Presiding: **Linda Stamato**, Public Member of the Commission on Higher Education

Panelists: **Peter Costigan**, General Counsel, Council of Governing Boards (Independent Colleges and Universities in the State of New York)

Sanford Jaffe, Officer-in-Charge, Government Law Project, The Ford Foundation, New York City

Courts Oulahan, General Counsel, Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools

The Proceedings

Outcomes Assessment— A New Era in Accreditation

Keynote Address

HOWARD R. BOWEN

Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased and honored to meet with you this afternoon and to take part in a meeting built around the theme of outcomes assessment.

I think that the educational community on the whole has been derelict in its rather unfruitful efforts up to this time to measure performance in terms of the true ends of education. I am pleased that the voluntary accrediting associations are taking the lead in shifting attention to the outcome of education as criteria and measures of performance.

I have been reminded that the Middle States Association is a body composed of schools as well as colleges. My own professional experience has been entirely in higher education, and I feel unsure and awkward when I try to extend my thoughts to cover elementary and secondary education. I suspect that the schools are much further advanced than the colleges in the matter of evaluation. Nevertheless, I hope that most of what I have to say will apply to education at all levels.

We are all in this together, and I trust that each of you will be able to interpret what I have to say in the light of your own experience and your own problems. I shall be considering the question of evaluation, of what an institution might do to learn more about the true results of its efforts. I have in mind that evaluation which is more informative and more credible than that which most institutions achieve would have several good results beyond merely proving how good we are, and that such evaluation need not be expensive beyond its worth.

Among the words most frequently used these days in academic discourse are management, planning, and accountability. Behind these words is the implied criticism that education is not well managed, and that business-like rationality should become the academic enterprise. Such rationality presumes that goals should be clearly defined, that resources should be deployed to achieve these goals, and that end results should be rigorously assessed in terms of these same goals.

This rational or managerial planning approach is held to be essential to efficient use of resources and also to accountability. As I shall make clear, I have grave misgivings about some of the simplistic notions that the concepts of business management can be applied to education or that they will solve financial and educational problems. Yet I think the concept of efficiency has a place in all human endeavors, including such areas as foreign policy, military strategy, religion, art, marriage, or even poker.

Howard R. Bowen is Avery Professor of Economics and Education at the Claremont Graduate School. Prior to his assuming this position in 1975, he was Chancellor of the Claremont University Center and before that, President of Grinnell College and the University of Iowa.

Education is surely no exception, in that there are better ways and poorer ways of going about the teaching/learning process, and there are also more expensive and less expensive ways of going about it. The most efficient way is the one that yields the highest ratio of results to cost. This may involve personal attention to students as individuals. It may involve non-bureaucratic organization. It may call for a measured pace. It may call for an environment conducive to cultural advancement. And some of these that I've mentioned are often thought of as the very antithesis of managerial efficiency.

Yet when you think about it education has its goals and it has its means, and the problem of efficiency is to relate the means to the goals in such a way as to get the best results.

Let me recite to you certain epigrams that have guided me in my thinking about efficiency in education, and by citing these epigrams I can also display the purity of my motives.

The first is by Cardinal Newman, who said: "A university is an alma mater, knowing her children one by one, not a foundry or a mint or a treadmill."

The second epigram is from John Dewey: "What the best and wisest parent wants for a child, that must the community want for all its children. Any other ideal for our schools is narrow and unlovely, and, acted upon, it destroys our democracy."

The third one is by an economist friend of mine who said: "Statistics are no substitute for judgment."

But having uttered these disclaimers let me assert that I think education could be more efficient in the sense of John Dewey or Cardinal Newman or my economist friend if greater attention were paid to discovering the outcomes. This is one of the conclusions that I reached in the course of a several-year study that I conducted a few years ago that led to a book called "Investment in Learning."

In this study I was looking at the higher educational system as a whole and trying to answer the question "What do the American people actually get for the \$80 + billion a year they spend, directly or indirectly, on higher education?" I tried to absorb the studies of educationists and psychologists and sociologists and economists and public opinion specialists and social critics about the effects of higher education on individual students and on society at-large, and I tried to judge what this fragmented mass of literature adds up to.

From these efforts I was pleasantly surprised to find that there is considerable knowledge, at least evidence, about the consequences of higher education, and it seemed to me that this evidence on the whole supports the view that higher education is indeed worth what it costs.

I was also struck by the apparent agreement among educators and educational philosophers about the goals for higher education. Though there may be differences in the priorities attached to various goals and differences between the goals as conceived in theory and as actually pursued in practice, yet in general there is rough agreement as to what higher education ought to be or try to achieve.

At the same time I could not help but be struck by the limitations and the raggedness of our knowledge about the outcomes, and by the vast gulf between our

catalog and commencement rhetoric and our demonstrable performance. May I say that I have been as guilty as anyone of unjustified rhetoric on behalf of higher education.

I also explored the differences among institutions and I was amazed to find how small these differences really are when allowance is made for the characteristics of the entering students. When outcomes are considered in terms of change in students over the college years, the differences among institutions tend to melt away. Differences do remain, to be sure, but they are far less than one would suppose and it is not always the richest or the most selective or the most famous institutions that have the greatest impact.

Another of my reactions was that institutions individually know very little about their results. There have been sporadic one-time studies in particular institutions made by interested professors of psychology or education, and also a number of one-time studies of small samples of institutions, but few systematic ongoing efforts to assess outcomes of particular institutions. Such studies, it seems to me, are urgently needed if institutions are to have better information for management and accountability, if I may use those words, and if we are to learn more about the consequences of what we are doing.

Without such knowledge, institutions are destined in their decision processes merely to follow tradition, or to do what is expedient in terms of inside, or outside political pressures, or to be vulnerable to every fad that sweeps through the educational community, or to manage by intuition, or some of all four. I have respect for tradition because it is the result of a kind of natural selection achieved through many trials and errors. I understand political pressures; I have felt them. I believe that institutions should be open to the new, and I respect intuition, especially when it is practiced by experienced and sensitive persons. And I am aware that it is often all we have to go on.

Yet I feel we need not be restricted by tradition, political pressure, fad, and intuition, and that these can be supplemented by knowledge. If the nature of our task is such that we must much of the time fly blind, it would be good at least to have radar, which would give us some general sense of our direction. If we had more knowledge it would improve accountability, which would no longer be limited to pretty sounding adjectives, and it would raise the motivation of both students and faculty and enhance a community spirit of achievement.

What do we mean by the outcomes of an educational institution? There are basically two ways of looking at them, though in the end these tend to merge into one. The first approach is to regard the institution as an environment consisting of facilities, personnel, and a technology which is made available to students. How students use this environment and what they get out of it is their responsibility according to this view and not the business of the institution. In this formulation the task of the school or college is simply to provide opportunity. The outcomes from the standpoint of the institution are then simply the facilities, personnel, and technology made available; and these can be measured by dollars expended, faculty salaries, student/faculty ratio, square feet of floor space, average College Board scores, and so on. These are, of course, all means from another point of view, but

they are the familiar criteria that we use for measuring what we sometimes call academic quality. And they have the advantage of easy measurability.

The second approach to outcomes is to carry the institutional obligation one step further; that is, to consider the school or college responsible for what ultimately happens to the student. This implies that the facilities, personnel, and technology become inputs or means rather than outcomes or ends. The institution then becomes directly concerned with the motivation and stimulation of the student and with helping him to make the best use of the available resources. It then defines its outcomes in terms of the change that occurs in the student by reason of his education.

This second formulation, which states outcomes as ends or outputs rather than as means, seems to me to be more appropriate than the first because it relates outcomes to the ultimate objective of schools and colleges, which is to influence human development.

The second formulation is also preferred because inputs of money, facilities, staff, and so on, are not necessarily correlated with ultimate outcomes. It is not hard to think of comparable institutions with quite different expenditures per student and with no appreciable differences in outcomes, and one can think of many low-budget institutions that perform just as well in relation to the characteristics of their entering students as some high-budget institutions.

I've been studying this question of costs and their relationship to outcomes with some care in recent months, and one of the things that I find most embarrassing in a way is the lack of correlation between expenditures and outcomes considered as development of students. There are some great differences among institutions in their outcomes if you look at students as they are when they depart, but if you consider what has happened to the students, how they have developed during their educational experience, the differences are remarkably small and the differences in cost are remarkably great.

Once an institution becomes interested in its outcomes then it must become conscious of its goals, and that in itself is an advantage. Its goals are its intended outcomes. They are hypotheses about what outcomes are feasible. Since negative outcomes are not only possible but present in every institution — in the form of failures, unwise dropouts, discouragement, suppression of creativeness, acquisition of bad habits, and even suicide — in view of the fact that all institutions have negative outcomes, some of the goals must be in the form of what to avoid as well as what to achieve.

In general five kinds of positive goals will be of interest.

1. Almost everyone is concerned about the cognitive development of students — their verbal and quantitative skills, their substantive knowledge, their rationality, critical thinking.
2. Almost everyone is concerned about their aesthetic sensibility.
3. Emotional and moral development, including personal self-discovery, religious interest, psychological well-being.
4. Practical competence in citizenship, in their work, in family life, in consumption, leisure, and health.

5. Direct satisfactions and enjoyment from education during the school and college years as well as in later life.

These are the things we are trying to maximize. Any institution would be interested in knowing what happens to its students as a result of their attendance with respect to some or all of these goals. By finding out they might be led to modify their orientation, their program, or their technologies.

Institutions might well wish also to evaluate a wide variety of benefits to society at large that flow from education, but today at least I am going to confine my remarks to outcomes relating to individual students. At this point my remarks will become more specifically directed toward higher education and I hope when properly translated they will be relevant to elementary and secondary education as well.

This has been a long introduction — in fact, it's almost as long as the rest of the paper — but I should now like to turn to the practical implementation of evaluation in a particular institution. I have no special insight into this matter. I'm an economist and not a psychologist or sociologist. I'm not supposed to know anything about this except what I have read from other sources. I do not regard whatever suggestions I have as either authoritative or exhaustive, but I hope they will be illustrative. Indeed I would hope that as institutions move into assessment of outcomes they will discover new approaches and methods, and I have no doubt that that will happen.

My purpose is to suggest possibilities and ideas and to indicate the values deriving from the study of outcomes, not to lay out a full-scale plan. First I shall describe some possible procedures and then consider some practical issues especially related to cost and finance.

The first step is to establish the goals of the institutions, and I mention this with some trepidation because my experience at least has been that when institutions become involved with defining their goals they encounter great difficulty and arid controversy, and they end up with meaningless and abstract compromises.

One of the advantages of outcome assessment would be to force faculties and administrators to think of their goals in concrete and operational terms. One of the exciting prospects would be to identify the objectives of an institution in such a way that one could tell to what extent they were actually being achieved.

The next step would be the actual gathering of information about the attainment of goals, and one would surely start with the students. The question to be asked would be: In what ways do students change? One would be on the lookout for negative as well as positive changes. The point of view would be that of comparing students when they enter and when they graduate or leave, to ascertain the amount of change or growth or development or value added. One would be interested in dropouts and transfers, as well as in freshmen who stayed on to graduation. Tests and other instruments would surely have a place in such a program.

For example, in measuring change in verbal and mathematical skill or in measuring change in cognitive achievement in liberal learning and in major fields, there are many standardized tests that are readily available and could be used, and more are being developed.

Similarly, in judging change in values, interests, life objectives, and various personality traits many well-known tests are available, among them the one I know about is the Omnibus Personality Inventory that was developed at the Berkeley Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. There are tests of proficiency in various practical skills. One instance of very fruitful use of these tests is found in the comparative study of eight diverse institutions which was done at Berkeley by Clark, McConnell, Trow, and others. And I should expect that institutions would devise new tests or procedures, not all of them of the usual standardized type.

Another kind of exploration that would be revealing would be a study of the allocation by students of their time. Logically the time of students is an input rather than an outcome, but it is a reasonable assumption that the results of education are highly correlated with the use of time for various purposes; and so by learning about time allotments one might make some valid inferences about outcomes.

Alexander Astin has experimented with the recording of student time allocations and he has produced astounding data on differences among institutions in the way students use their time, and also on differences in time use within particular institutions over periods of years. Indeed I would like to acknowledge that much of my thinking about evaluation was triggered by these time use studies of Astin.

The kinds of investigations I have been talking about so far would provide information on average changes along particular dimensions of personality. For instance, one would know, in terms of standard deviation units, by how much students on the average gained in verbal skills or religious interest or aesthetic sensibility or general knowledge or life goals, or whatever. Data of these kinds tell something about students on the average, but they tell very little about what actually happens to individual students considered as whole persons. Indeed the average changes on these various personality dimensions are usually very small and lead the unwary to the conclusion that college really doesn't matter very much. College may exert a major impact on its students even when there is little or no change in average scores on particular characteristics.

The explanation of this seeming paradox is that there can be enormous changes in individuals while the averages change little or not at all. Every tabulation of scores on specialized test instruments shows wide disparities in what happens to individuals as they are affected by college. On any given dimension some students will gain ground, some will lose ground, and some will not change at all. Aggregates and averages reflect the central tendency of all these wide variations and conceal the substantial changes experienced by many individuals.

For example, Feldman and Newcomb cite a study in which a group of freshmen achieved an average score on religious value of 41.75, and the identical students as seniors scored 41.57; that is, they regressed by a few hundredths of one point over four years. But the individual students making up the group showed changes as follows: -19, -16, -14, -12, -2, +3, +7, +11, +12, +16. A comparison of the two averages would lead to the conclusion that no change had occurred, and yet the individual scores revealed enormous variability.

The purpose of higher education is not necessarily to produce changes for all its students along every dimension of personality development. This would clearly be impossible and undesirable. Colleges accept individual differences among their students, and encourage each student to develop along lines compatible with his unique interests and talents. Such development inevitably means substantial progress along some lines, no change along others, and regression along still others. And regression along some lines is not necessarily a sign of failure.

For example, a student who had devoted much of his time in high school to music may discover interests in science in college. As a result he may regress during college on aestheticism and progress on intellectuality, or on scientific interests.

While listening to the musicians today I thought that these young people are obviously developing themselves according to talent very intensively along certain directions, and one knows that in a specialized music school there is less time for students to branch out in the fields of science and literature and art and other fields. These are choices that people make according to their talents, and you would expect a different profile of growth from these students that we heard play so beautifully today than we would from students having different interests, informations, and talents.

Or, to take another example, a student may come to college with highly developed mathematical skills, but he may discover new interests in social issues that result in a regression along the mathematical dimension but progression along the political dimension. These regressions are not necessarily negative outcomes. They simply represent constructive changes in personality configuration as a result of exposure to new opportunities.

It is unreasonable to expect any person to progress simultaneously along all possible lines. People differ so much in the distribution of their talents, and the pursuit of any one interest tends to be at the cost of the pursuit of other interests, and the totally well-rounded individual who pursued every interest would surely be a bland, innocuous, mediocre person. There is an economy of interests, and to attain excellence in some interests will be at the cost of achievement in others. Excellence of personality involves choices based on a weighing of values in relation to interests and talents and callings, and not equal pursuit of every value that can be conceived of.

This means that to observe the true outcomes of education in all their variability tests are not enough. It is necessary to observe the changes in individual students as whole persons. The problem calls for the study of people in some depth as well as the study of particular aspects of their personal development. The few studies that focus on whole persons yield results that come closer to the changes that every educator observes in his students during and after college than typical studies based on average changes in particular dimensions of personality or on particular tasks. Statistically the changes should be measured as profiles or syndromes or Gestalts, and not as average changes on particular dimensions.

To study the outcomes of college in terms of whole persons is clearly more difficult, more challenging, and potentially more rewarding than the study of particular personality dimensions using standardized tests that never come close to

the student as a human being. The reason I say this would be challenging and rewarding is that at present our colleges do not on the whole ever take account of their students as persons, not even the colleges that claim to be small and personal. The student's record is seen as a collection of disconnected courses. His life is seen in terms of his participation in this or that extracurricular activity, in his dormitory, in the placement office, and so on. The college officially never really concerns itself with its students as unique persons. The exceptions may be the contacts with individual professors in some cases. The coaches often get to know their people well. Students who work on college jobs sometimes get to be well-known by the persons under whom they work. But the great rank and file, especially in larger institutions, are anonymous people whose exposure to the official college or university is always partial and fleeting. The latter kind of association, the kind where they are considered as whole human beings, tends to be reserved for peers and that may explain why the peer influence is relatively so powerful in student development.

How would one measure or judge the change or growth or development of a student as a whole person over the course of his or her college career? One would, of course, integrate the admissions data, the grade transcript, the results of various tests. From these one would generate an informational profile that would say a great deal about the outcomes for that person. This information might be augmented by records on the student's extracurricular activities, including his work, his housing, his travel, and his other activities or achievements. It would also be augmented by questionnaires perhaps, giving the student a chance to express his views about what happened to him as he progressed through the institution. Professor Pace of UCLA has used this type of questionnaire to good effect, for example, in his Carnegie book called "Demise of Diversity."

It is possible that the academic papers that the student has written and the projects he has completed during his college career would be assembled.

All of this material would be systematically evaluated. To top off the process there ought to be, it seems to me, two oral interviews. One of these interviews would occur shortly after admission, and the other would occur at the time of graduation, or leaving for other reasons. Each of these oral interviews would be designed to get acquainted with the student, to express the serious interest of the institution in him, and to evaluate his progress. The initial interview would be primarily forward looking, and the exit interview would be primarily retrospective. The purpose of both would be to import an element of human judgment into the evaluative process and to make official contact with each student as a whole person.

The outcomes of college are revealed not only by what happens to students during the college years, but also by what happens to them in later life. A sound evaluation scheme will therefore give attention to alumni.

It is an astounding fact that almost nothing is known about the carryover of learning or cognitive development to later life. One may suspect a conspiracy to avoid collecting this information because it might be embarrassing. In the cognitive area everyone knows that the half-life of memorized details or skills from academic learning is short unless the information or the skills are frequently used. What is apparently not known is the residue that is left from the academic learning when the

details have been lost. The residue may be in the form of verbal facility, broad general principles, ways of looking at the world, improvement in the ability to learn, and so on. But there is no satisfactory evidence anywhere, I am convinced, on what is carried over from college learning to later life.

The apparent reasons for this sad state of ignorance are, first, that there are few occasions in adult life to examine or retest people in knowledge that they may have acquired in college; and, second, that the academic and career experiences of students are so diverse that standardized tests would not be appropriate in judging the effects of college as seen in alumni.

These reasons are not wholly persuasive, however. Skill and knowledge, as Nevitt Sanford has said, are the easiest of all personal characteristics to measure, and the logistics of examining or testing samples of alumni would not be prohibitive. It would not be totally out of the question to devise tests over skills, ideas, and information that would be expected to be the common property of college-educated persons. Among such skills and information would be the ability to read, write, and speak, and knowledge of certain basic concepts and reference points.

Incidentally, Pace also uses questionnaires to alumni to good effect, asking them questions about what they got out of college and what college meant to them. His thinking about this is that the people who know more about the outcomes than anyone else are the participants themselves.

I think it would be wonderfully interesting if a college or university would invent ways of discovering something about the carryover of college learning to life after college. It would be good to know what survives and what develops not only in cognitive knowledge and skills, but also in the aesthetic field — in values, attitudes, and practical skills.

A smattering of this kind of information is found in public opinion surveys. There are two very fine books that have recently appeared using a great many public opinion surveys to find out what people know, and they represent a beginning in this area.

Also, some information can be found in the studies of economists and sociologists on occupations and earnings.

However, so far as I know, despite all the interest in the cultivation of alumni, almost nothing has been done by institutions to find out what they really got out of college.

Some other possibilities for evaluation would include obtaining information systematically from accrediting teams, from site visitors — every college has numerous site visitors who come to their campuses from time to time, and from other outside evaluators; and systematic paying attention to what outsiders think of institutions is another form of institutional evaluation that should become part of the whole process. Along this line visiting professors might be routinely asked to record their impressions because any visiting professor coming into an institution becomes very sensitive to what that institution is like and he forms opinions about how things are there compared to other places he has been.

Finally I would mention the unobtrusive indicators that were so amusingly described by Hodgkinson. These are indicators that any stranger can plainly see, such

as the bulletin boards. I use the unobtrusive method all the time when I visit colleges. The bulletin boards are very interesting indexes of what is going on around there.

Also, the merchandise in the book store. Is it all beer mugs and peanuts, or are there real books in there?

The graffiti are very interesting. The number of faculty and student cars found in the parking lots in the late afternoon and evening and on weekends is another unobtrusive indicator, as is the library collection and attendance in the library; and even, Hodgkinson mentions, the number of dogs on the campus. There are some campuses that are full of dogs and others don't have so many, and Hodgkinson interprets a numerous dog population as indicating a high need for nurturance and acceptance.

Finally, in a program of evaluation one could envision occasional special studies to try to discover the impact on students of particular programs. For example you might want to find out what difference it makes whether you have a psychological counseling program or what difference it makes when you change residential policies or what happens when you change academic calendar.

We've had a kind of revolution in the academic calendar in the United States in recent years, and I've never heard of anyone who would ever ascribe any educational benefit or harm to this change in the calendar. I don't think we know what we're doing.

The same thing does for changes in curricular requirements, and usually these changes come and go without anyone ever learning about their actual effects on students. In fact, one of the less inspirational parts of academic life is to be in a typical faculty meeting in which learned men and women are debating educational and curricular policy. They make extended speeches on the advantages of this or that requirement without the remotest notion of what difference their proposals would make in the development of students.

Under these conditions educational policy becomes largely a contest of parochial interests, rather than a rational consideration of educational ends and means.

I have suggested or outlined a very elaborate evaluation scheme. Many of you have probably long since concluded that I am a dreamer, and if I think any such plan is either workable or affordable I must be slightly insane. Let me come down to earth and consider some practical issues.

First, there is the technical problem of controls for extraneous variables. When you're trying to find out what difference college makes, you've got to be sure you're ruling out what difference other influences on the student — his family life and background and other influences of the community — are making. How does one know whether what happens to students in college is due to native ability or family background, the mass media, or to the normal maturation process?

I think these problems can easily be sidestepped in two ways. Remember, the focus here is on evaluation of the institution, not on evaluation of the students. One way would be to observe change over time in the observed results obtained by the particular institution under study. I mentioned Astin's work on the use of students' time, and one of the things that was so interesting to me on that was that over time

the institutions changed in the way their students spent their time.

If you are in an institution and you find that your students are spending less time on academic activities now than they were five years ago, you have something to worry about; and so your control is found by making comparisons over a period.

Another way of looking at it, which I find very appealing, would be to join with other comparable institutions in the evaluative process so that each institution could compare its results with others. Ideally the group of institutions would be those which are not mutually competitive, so that there would be no difficulty about sharing information.

This lead me to another problem, publicity. My preference would be for making the whole evaluation process public. I'm not anxious to tell the world how bad my institution is or what its problems are, but if you are to enlist the support of the entire college community in improving an institution the knowledge of what is happening to outcomes must be shared with the whole community. It must be known certainly by the faculty and by the administration, so that people can see what is wrong and get behind improvement. If these results are kept secret, just for administrative use or something of that kind, they don't have any function in developing community effort toward improvement; nor do they do anything for answering the cry for accountability.

I think there is very little alternative to being open, as open about this matter as one would be open about explaining the admissions requirements or the financial position of the institution.

Finally I come to the question of cost. I do not pretend that the program I have outlined would be easy or cheap. Substantial parts of the program could be started soon and without exorbitant cost, but the entire concept would require a great deal of invention, learning, operational time, and money. I would favor starting on a small scale and learning as one would go along. I also favor — in fact, I would insist — using sampling techniques, small samples. Understand, the purpose here is to evaluate the institution, not to evaluate students. Therefore you don't have to have every student included in the evaluation process. You work with a small sample, which cuts the work and time and cost enormously.

With the sampling procedure it seems to me that almost any institution could afford a considerable evaluation program. Mr. Pace, whom I have mentioned several times, also when he is evaluating institutions uses very short test instruments. When you're not trying to discriminate among students you don't have to have long complicated tests, just short tests will be adequate for getting information of a kind that relates to the institution as distinct from discriminating among students.

The resources would come, in my opinion, in the beginning from foundations. I know there would be openings from foundations and special gifts for the startup phase. But we all know that gifts and grants from these sources are not permanent and eventually they come to an end and must be replaced. I think this program ought to be incorporated into the teaching load of the faculty, and that the participation of students in this kind of program would be a learning experience for them and they should receive credit for the time they are spending on it, which would incorporate

it in the total teaching load and reduce the number of course registrations, which would reduce the total teaching load so that this program could become part of a given budget of an institution.

I think the institutions that will give leadership in the matter of evaluation will be helping to learn how this job can be done and will find the costs returned to them many times over, partly because evaluation is a way to demonstrable quality and partly because it is a way also to true accountability. It seems to me that money would follow demonstrated quality and accountability.

By way of summary I am going to mention several principles that I think might be followed in the identification and evaluation of outcomes:

1. The study of outcomes should be focused on the development of persons and not on means and resources.
2. Assessment should be linked to all the major goals of education and not confined to those that are easily testable or that relate to finances.
3. Outcomes assessment should be based on the study of alumni as well as students.
4. Outcomes assessment should be concerned with change in students as a result of their educational experience, not merely with their absolute level of performance during and after their school or college experience.
5. The evaluation scheme must be practicable. It should not be impossibly expensive or time consuming.
6. The methods of outcomes assessment should develop from the bottom up within individual colleges and universities and schools rather than be imposed from the top down by federal or state government or by national accrediting bodies. There is need for a great deal of experimentation in concepts and methods. Assessment should be related to the special missions or philosophies of particular institutions and should not be restricted to procedures and instruments that can be used nationally.

Business Meeting of the Association

Report of the President

JOSEPH P. SABO

One of the advantages of our annual meeting is an opportunity for individuals from different schools at all levels to meet our professional staff. While the staff of the Commission on Secondary Schools, the Commission on Higher Education, and the Elementary Assembly have demonstrated this past year an increased effort to reach out to member institutions, I have been asked to emphasize this point to you now.

The staff members are interested in having you seek out the appropriate individuals if you have a problem, in having you take advantage of this opportunity.

On reflection much of the activities of the offices this past year can be summarized into a brief phrase: "service to members." This is evidenced by a number of things:

1. A major reorganization by the Secondary School office and assignment of staff members to more adequately meet the needs of the constituency.
2. The timely special meetings of the Commission on Higher Education with college presidents and state government officials.
3. The Kissinger-like appearances of our peripatetic Elementary Assembly Director in response to the growing elementary school constituency.

The Board and I have encouraged and supported this new service thrust of our Association. In the context of outcomes and accountability it can be easily understood as a reaffirmation of our professional commitment to the voluntary process of evaluation and accreditation as a means of improving the quality of education in our schools.

I applaud your responses to these efforts and wish to thank the members of our professional staff. I give special thanks to Bob Kirkwood, Bill Etsweiler, John Stoops, and Cal Crawford. These people have always responded to my personal requests as I have attempted to provide leadership in carrying out the work of this Association.

Your officers have met with the officers of the other regional accrediting associations in discussions of common problems in an attempt to seek common solutions. Your Board of Trustees is an active Board, and through the work of its various committees the members have demonstrated their willingness to respond to the problems of our times as well as to improve this Association.

This labor would not be possible if individuals within our Association were not provided with support and approval by their own local boards. I express my appreciation at this time to the members of the Board of Education of Watchung Hills

Joseph P. Sabo is Superintendent of the Watchung Hills Regional High School District in Warren, New Jersey. First elected to the Board of Trustees in 1975, he previously had served two terms on the Association's Commission on Secondary Schools.

Regional High School, and especially to Mr. Edgar Van Benschoten, its President, for his support and encouragement to my own work in Middle States.

Finally, every involvement in association work by an individual, especially an officer, has an effect elsewhere — an effect in time, in energy, and thought. My good wife Anne has shared with me many of the benefits and pleasures of this involvement, but she has also known some of the problems, some of the difficulties; and for this I have a special feeling.

We have one official action on the agenda which is related to the Assembly on Elementary School. The Board of Trustees at its spring meeting took action to:

1. Authorize and encourage the Assembly of Elementary Schools and the Commission on Secondary Schools to seek affiliations for organizational membership in the Middle States Association by public school districts and central offices of diocesan school districts.

2. Request that in accordance with Article III, Section 3 of the Bylaws such applications be presented to the Board or its Executive Committee, which is authorized to review and pass upon such applications between meetings of the Board.

3. Pursuant to Article XIII of the Bylaws set the annual dues for organizational members at \$100 effective January 1, 1980.

These matters were passed by the Board of Trustees and according to our Bylaws they are to be brought before the delegates at this meeting. I would ask at this time for an acceptance and approval of this action.

(A motion to this effect was made, seconded, put to a vote and carried.)

Four years ago this week, in December of 1975, my predecessor explained the necessity for a dues increase which he was about to propose. He explained that the adjustment was designed to support the Association and its commissions for a three-year period, through the fiscal year 1978-79, at which time it was expected that our reserves would experience a substantial depletion, triggering the need for another increase. You approved his proposal at that time.

Last year I was able to report that careful budget construction by the Trustees and careful budget keeping by the commissions would enable us to extend the current dues schedule for a fourth year, through 1979-80. Today I am pleased to report once again we are able to extend the current dues structure for an additional year, a fifth year, through fiscal 1980-81.

This pleasant state of affairs is, as I explained, partly due to careful budgeting, but it is also related to the reserve fund policy approved by the Trustees at its spring meeting in 1978.

I call your attention to the fund balance on the lower part of the upper half of the balance sheet. This fund is essentially two-tiered. The first tier, the contingency reserve, is maintained to protect against major contingencies and unforeseen extraordinary expenses. The amount of this fund, which is reviewed periodically by the Trustees, has been set at \$500,000 for the past four years and most likely will obtain for 1980-81.

The second tier, the income stabilization fund, is maintained to provide the Association with a stable flow of income between dues adjustments.

This fund will range from being larger in the early years of a dues cycle to smaller towards the end. The exhaustion or anticipated exhaustion of this fund will trigger consideration of an adjustment in the dues schedule.

You will note in the fund balance section that the contingency reserve fund now stands at \$500,000, as mandated, and the income stabilization fund at \$207,923. It is this latter fund which will permit the fifth year extension of current dues to 1980-81. However, this year's operating budget provides for a deficit of \$123,000, which will have to be applied against the \$207,000. Then in 1981-82 another deficit would reasonably be expected, and that, of course, will almost certainly deplete the fund, calling for a dues increase in that year.

Next month the Finance Committee is expected to commence a series of meetings addressed to a proposal for a dues adjustment to be presented to you at this meeting next year.

The printed Treasurer's Report which you have before you is drawn from the full report of our auditors, Samuel M. Fisher & Co. The complete audited statement will appear in the published proceedings of this meeting.

Rollin P. Baldwin is President of the Baldwin Schools of New York City and Puerto Rico. He has just completed his fourth consecutive term as Treasurer. He previously served six years as a member of the Association's Commission on Secondary Schools and at this meeting was elected to a three year term on the Board of Trustees.

AUDITOR'S REPORT

To the Board of Trustees
Middle States Association of
Colleges and Schools
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

We have examined the balance sheet of Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (a non-profit association) as of June 30, 1979, and the related statement of revenues, expenses and fund balances, and schedules of unrestricted revenues and functional expenses for the year then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion, the financial statements mentioned above present fairly the financial position of Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools at June 30, 1979 and the results of its operations for the year then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

SAMUEL M. FISHER AND COMPANY
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
September 4, 1979

MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

BALANCE SHEET June 30, 1978

ASSETS

UNRESTRICTED ASSETS

Cash (including certificates of deposit and savings accounts of \$848,871)	856,579	
Dues and fees receivable	8,000	
Reimbursables receivable	43,533	
Other receivables	9,115	
Prepaid expenses	<u>24,092</u>	
		941,319

RESTRICTED CASH (Note 2) 8,429

PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT, at cost

Leasehold improvements	23,562
Furniture and equipment	52,684
	76,246
Less accumulated amortization and depreciation	(18,869)
	57,377
	<u>1,007,125</u>

LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES

UNRESTRICTED LIABILITIES

Accrued expenses	6,299
Annuities withheld	3,676
Deferred membership dues	223,421
	233,396

FUND BALANCE

Unrestricted (Note 5):

Appropriated for:

Contingency reserve	50,000
Income stabilization	207,923
Property and equipment	57,377
	765,300

Restricted (Note 2)	8,429
---------------------	-------

773,729

1,007,125

**STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES,
AND FUND BALANCES**

Year Ended June 30, 1979

Unrestricted:

Revenues:

Dues and annual fees	955,741
Commission on Secondary Schools	6,805
Commission on Higher Education	24,077
Assembly of Elementary Schools	2,000
Association office	73,471
Honoraria and travel costs (reimbursed)	137,914

1,200,008

Expenses:	
Commission on Secondary Schools	377,869
Commission on Higher Education	298,807
Assembly of Elementary Schools	51,434
Association office	172,693
Middle States Association (Note 3)	123,478
Total functional expenditures	1,024,281
Honoraria and travel costs (reimbursed)	137,914
	<u>(1,162,195)</u>
Excess of revenues over expenses	37,813
Fund balance, July 1, 1978	727,487
Fund balance, June 20, 1979	<u>765,300</u>
Restricted:	
Revenues:	
Grants	15,000
Expenses	<u>(7,101)</u>
Excess of expenses over revenues	7,899
Fund balance, July 1, 1978	
Fund balance, June 30, 1979	<u>530</u>
	<u>8,429</u>

The Notes to Financial Statements are an integral part of this statement.

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

Note 1. Summary of Accounting Policies

The Association is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The accompanying financial statements are prepared on the accrual basis of accounting.

Property and equipment are recorded at cost and depreciated on the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the assets, which are 10 years for leasehold improvements and 8 years for furniture and equipment.

The membership year corresponds to the Association's fiscal year. Dues received in advance are deferred and recorded as revenue during the subsequent membership year.

Note 2. Restricted Balances

The Association has received restricted grants from the National Study of School Evaluation and the U.S. State Department (Overseas). These grants require the Association to manage and account for the funds separately and return all funds not expended at the completion of the projects. The activity for the year ended June 30, 1979 was as follows:

	National Study of School Evaluation	U.S. State Department (Overseas #1)	U.S. State Department (Overseas #2)	Total
Grants	—	2,000	13,000	15,000
Expenses	768	1,762	4,571	7,101
Excess (deficit) of revenues over expenses	(768)	238	8,429	7,899
Fund Balance, July 1, 1978	768	(238)	—	530
Fund balance, June 30, 1979	—	—	8,429	8,429

Note 3. Leases

The Association leases its facilities in Philadelphia under an agreement expiring in December, 1986 which provides for a minimum annual rental of approximately \$54,000. Rent expense for the year ended June 30, 1979 was \$59,914 and is included in the statement of revenues and expenses under Middle States Association expenses.

Note 4. Retirement Plan

The Association participates in the TIAA-CREF Educational Retirement Plan which is a contributory plan covering all employees. The TIAA-CREF system permits annuity premiums to be invested, through CREF, in common stocks, and, through TIAA, in fixed-dollar obligations. Professional and administrative personnel can participate in the plan immediately whereas secretarial and clerical personnel, at their option, can participate in the plan after continuous employment for one year, or two years if under 25 years of age. Under the plan, all personnel vest immediately in all benefits purchased; the Association contributes an amount equal to 10% of the employee's basic salary and the employee may contribute from 5% to the limit set by the Internal Revenue Service, based upon a longevity formula.

Contributions charged to operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1979 aggregated \$51,565. The plan is in compliance with the requirements of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

Note 5. Unrestricted Funds

The Board of Trustees has authorized the appropriation from the unrestricted fund as follows:

Contingency reserve — balance of \$500,000

Income stabilization — equal to the remaining balance of the unrestricted fund

Property and equipment — equal to the net book value of property and equipment

When confronted with a time limit of five minutes for what should be a major presentation the first sacrifice to be offered up is a title and the second is any attempt at platform humor. Should time have permitted I would have laid on "Accreditation as a Poor Risk" as a sufficiently startling headline. This notion is rooted in the experience of the past year when the Treasurer of the Association and I attempted on behalf of the six regional accrediting associations to obtain a single liability insurance policy which would at reasonable cost protect the several associations from assessed damages should a successful suit be brought against one or more of us.

This effort was eventually to be stretched out over an 11-month period before coming to an unsuccessful conclusion just a few days ago. Why this reluctance on the part of the industry to write collectively what has been written individually over the past several years? Generally speaking, insurance is difficult to come by for any one of a number of reasons.

One is, of course, age. While our Association is in its 93rd year, regional accreditation activity itself dates back a mere 50 of those years, an actuarial group that Art Linkletter would consider to be in the prime of life.

Another factor is health, but there are today more accredited institutions than ever, with an even greater potential for the years to come.

It may be that we are engaged in a dangerous occupation, but to whom are we dangerous? The evaluators perhaps run the greatest risk of all at the opening night banquet in the school cafeteria.

Actually the circumstance that seemed to give the underwriters the greatest concern was the fact that the regional accrediting associations were so unlike any of the non-profit, particularly trade, associations with which they were used to dealing and whose business they actively solicit.

Furthermore, it was pointed out that not only are the six regionals different from the chicken producers, bricklayers, and travel agents, but they were different from each other. And this is true. Over the years in attempting to identify at which point organizationally the regionals might come together to communicate the only common element seemed to be that they each had an elected president. Admittedly this carries diversity to a degree not generally acknowledged or appreciated, and it does point up one unique strength of the accreditation movement in this country.

Clearly the modest and essential bureaucracy that has emerged has not overwhelmed the operation. No self-respecting bureaucrat would tolerate for long the absence of a handle with which to get a firm grip or a stranglehold on the situation. Nor, presumably, would the member institutions of any regional, with all their diversity, tolerate for long any attempt to streamline the process.

This is not to say that rigidity and outmoded procedures cannot exist or persist, but to the extent that they do it is usually by default.

This year, as my colleagues will shortly be reporting to you, has seen a marked

Calvin L. Crawford is the Executive Director of the Middle States Association.

and welcome increase in the level of direct participation in association affairs on the part of the membership. Some of the participation has been passive, as institutional representatives have been, as you are now, on the receiving end of information dissemination sessions. Much of it, however, has been active as new techniques and approaches to such time-honored concepts as self-study techniques and evaluative instruments have emerged directly from the concerned and affected constituency.

While we did fail to locate a single insurance umbrella under which the six regionals might seek safety from litigious fallout, we rediscovered by virtue of our uniqueness that we at least provide a moving target.

I am very happy to be able to report that the work of the Commission proceeds apace and that the Commission has experienced another highly successful year. As I look back over the past year three themes stand out as having characterized the year: first, efforts at improved administrative efficiency; secondly, flexibility in attempting to meet the needs of a very diverse constituency, while yet maintaining an essential unity; and, third, service to the membership with a personal touch. Now just a few comments on each of those areas.

With respect to administrative improvements the major activity in 1979 was the production and distribution to the membership of a completely revised Policies and Procedures Manual. This handbook, developed through the work of staff under the direction of a Commission sub-committee chaired by Dr. Marie Parnell, incorporates the many changes and improvements in Commission procedures which have become effective over the past half dozen years since the previous edition had been published.

I believe this marks a great step forward in the administrative efficiency of operating the Commission so that all member schools can turn to the Policies and Procedures handbook and know the procedures which are to be used in any instance, rather than having to be in touch with the office over every little item that may come up. We consider that a very important advance.

In the area of meeting the needs of its diverse constituency the Commission has continued to respond to the perceived needs of its private, independent, and church-related school sector, as well as to the needs of its overseas membership. At its meeting in November the Commission approved for use in appropriate circumstances the evaluative instrument published by the European Council of Independent Schools.

It approved, to meet the needs of very small schools, a reduction in the minimum visiting committee size from ten to six members. I think that is something that is sure to be appreciated in this inflationary economy.

It also approved the preliminary protocol for cooperation with the Assembly of Elementary Schools in conducting evaluations of schools and school systems which include grades kindergarten through grade 12. Again, this is a real step forward.

Efforts have been made and will continue to be made to improve communications and relationships with this very important sector of our membership.

In the third area of service, I reported last year at this meeting on a pilot progress report workshop conducted by members of the Commission staff. I am happy to report that this was so well received that during the current school year the professional staff will be presenting some 27 progress report workshops throughout the five-state Middle States region.

Thomas Bradshaw is Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Personnel Service, Edison, New Jersey. He has been a member of the Association's Commission on Secondary Schools since 1971 and its chairman for the past year.

At a meeting yesterday afternoon I heard one of our staff members remark that he had been in his office only three days during the month of November. All his other work days were out in the field. While I recognize the problems that this kind of activity poses for the professional staff in terms of accomplishing the very important administrative work that has to be done at the office, and also the sacrifice that much travel means in terms of their own personal lives, I couldn't help but be impressed when I heard how much time was being spent out with the membership.

I know I speak for the Commission when I say that to the Commission that's the name of the game, service to our membership. We want that to be the number one priority. We appreciate all that the staff is doing to be of service to our membership.

I would like to conclude with a word of thanks for that to our Executive Director, Dr. Bill Etsweiler, and to our four very efficient and dedicated Associate Directors for all that they have done this year to maintain and improve the work and the reputation for excellence of the Commission on Secondary Schools of the MSA.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is always a joy to share with you the new member schools that have come into their relationship officially with the Middle States Association Commission on Secondary Schools during this past year.

This past year we have gained 31 new member schools and I will be very brief in presenting the names of these schools, but I would draw your attention to the geographic spread of the locations of these schools:

Academic San Jose High School, Guaynabo, Puerto Rico
American Cooperative School, Monrovia, Liberia
American School of Kinshasa, Kinshasa, Zaire
American School of Mallorca, Mallorca, Spain
Arthur T. Howells Middle School, Moscow, Pennsylvania
Bryn Mawr School, Baltimore, Maryland
Bullis School, Inc. Upper School, Potomac, Maryland
Bullis School, Inc. Lower School, Potomac, Maryland
Cassadaga Valley Junior/Senior High School, Sinclairville, New York
De La Salle Vocational School, Cornwells Heights, Pennsylvania
Franklin Regional Junior High School, Murrysville, Pennsylvania
George W. Feaser Junior High School, Middletown, Pennsylvania
Hopatcong Junior/Senior High School, Hopatcong, New Jersey
Howard Career Center, Wilmington, Delaware
International School of Islamabad, Islamabad, Pakistan
John H. Glenn High School, Huntington, New York
Lake George Junior/Senior High School, Lake George, New York
Lincoln High School, Yonkers, New York
Minersville Area High School, Minersville, Pennsylvania
Muhlenberg Junior High School, Laureldale, Pennsylvania
Saint Maria Goretti High School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Southern Columbia Area Junior/Senior High School, Catawissa, Pennsylvania
South Side High School, Hookstown, Pennsylvania
Vernon Township High School, Vernon, New Jersey
Yonkers High School, Yonkers, New York

In addition to the schools that I've just named, that have come into membership by virtue of candidacy and now membership, we have gained schools by application of the Commission's divided school policy. I will read the names of those new schools:

Chesapeake High School, Pasadena, Maryland
Fallston High School, Fallston, Maryland
Hammond High School, Columbia, Maryland
Harford Vocational/Technical High School, Bel Air, Maryland
South River High School, Edgewater, Maryland
St. Albans School, Lower School, Washington, D.C.

William H. Etsweiler, Jr. is Executive Director of the Commission on Secondary Schools.

I am very pleased to report that the staff of the Commission is overworked. The statistics (and I won't go into all of them) indicate that our growth continues. At the present time 470 post-secondary institutions are members of the Association. This constitutes more than 95% of the not-for-profit institutions in our region, and if we include the proprietary institutions it is more than 85% of the total in the Middle States area.

During 1978-79 there were 31 candidates-for-accreditation institutions registered with us, and we projected an additional 10 during this coming year. The Commission will once again increase the number of evaluations to 46, up from 38, and the number of follow-up reports resulting from Commission actions will be increasing 66 to 75.

In addition, case studies, consultant visits, visits of members of the Commission and staff to institutions and joint evaluation visits with other accrediting groups are also on the increase. And I am constantly amazed how the small staff of the Commission is able to carry on this important work and to do it as well as it does.

One of the important developments that has taken place has been the development of the reports for progress. There had been concern that the 10-year period between reaccreditation visits was just too long to keep track of developments at each of our member institutions. Therefore beginning in 1973, when the policy was established, every five years in the interim period a periodic review report is due.

These reports began to arrive last year. The number is growing this year. The quality of these reports is for the most part excellent. In a few cases the reports were returned to the institution for improvement and additional information or additional follow-up work was required.

The Commission, in addition, has been continuing to provide workshops for first-time evaluators and this year for the first time all chairmen of evaluating teams for the 1979-80 academic year were called in to a workshop this fall. It provided not only an orientation for new chairmen, but it also permitted our veteran chairmen to be brought up to date on policies and procedures which have been modified or changed over the last few years.

It is interesting to note that in looking at the leadership of our institutions in a two-year period 167 presidencies became vacant. This is more than one-third of the total membership. I don't present this figure in order to indicate the precarious nature of the presidency, but to indicate the reasons for regional meetings which were held this fall for the first time.

These regional meetings were held in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Syracuse, and were attended by more than 200 presidents. Each provided an opportunity to bring the institutions in the region up to date, and at the same time it also provided a

Milton G. Bassin is President of York College of the City University of New York. He has been a member of the Association's Commission on Higher Education since 1971 and was elected its Chairperson in 1976.

forum for the institutions to communicate with the Commission.

The results of the meetings were excellent, and those who attended felt they should be continued.

Last year, you may recall, when I reported to the Association I expressed some concern about the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, the umbrella group for institutional and specialized accrediting bodies in the United States. That concern dealt mainly with the fiscal structure, the payment of dues by the regionals, and the Middle States in particular.

There has been some modification in the dues structure, but there is still concern. While we have approved the dues structure, I can report to you that one of the regionals still has not approved it. Their concern is as great as ours.

In the area of proliferation of accrediting bodies the COPA Board, while struggling to come to grips with this important facet of its work, has recognized that they have not done the job that is expected by the institutions in this country. They are working to develop some method of reducing the proliferation of these bodies.

COPA still remains the single group which can speak for the accrediting establishment in this country, and in the next area that I wish to report to you, they have done an exemplary job of bringing to the attention of our Congress the importance of maintaining the link between accreditation and eligibility.

For those of you who may not be familiar with the situation let me just review it for a moment because it is an issue that will be with us for some time to come. This past July the outgoing Secretary of HEW Califano proposed in his recommendations on higher education to sever the linkage between accreditation and eligibility and basically to turn over the question of eligibility to the states. This has been opposed by all the regional commissions, and it has been opposed by the specialized areas to a great degree as well.

I, in my capacity as Chairman and at the direction of the Commission, as my colleagues were doing in the other regionals, informed the membership of what was developing in Washington and I can report to you that the outpouring of support from institutions around this country to the subcommittee dealing with this matter was such that the legislation in higher education at the present time retains the linkage between eligibility and accreditation.

However, the chairman of the committee did indicate that the importance of this issue will require further hearings and these are expected to take place this coming spring. It is an item that we cannot afford to ignore. It is one that we must maintain a very current stance on, and it is an issue that will have implications for all of us in education.

Our relationships with the Higher Education Board have improved in the state of Maryland. We are working with the Council for Higher Education in Puerto Rico. We have indicated concerns in the state of Pennsylvania. In the state of New York there are ongoing discussions relating to state regulations and the position of the State Education Department of New York which favors separating the linkage between accreditation and eligibility.

**Summary of Action by the
Commission on Higher Education, January-December 1979**

NEWLY ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS

College of Medicine & Dentistry of New Jersey, Newark
Community College of Allegheny County:
 College Center North, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
International Institute of the Americas, Hato Rey, Puerto Rico
Reading Area Community College, Reading, Pennsylvania
Salem Community College, Penns Grove, New Jersey
State University of New York:
 College of Technology, Utica, New York

ACCREDITATION REAFFIRMED

Ana G. Mendez Educational Foundation:
 Colegio Universitario del Turabo, Caguas, Puerto Rico
Baltimore Hebrew College, Baltimore, Maryland
Beaver College, Glenside, Pennsylvania
Bloomsburg State College, Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania
Brookdale Community College, Lincroft, New Jersey
Caribbean Center for Advanced Studies, Santurce, Puerto Rico
Centenary College, Hackettstown, New Jersey
City University of New York:
 Bernard M. Baruch College, New York, New York
 Borough of Manhattan Community College, New York, New York
 La Guardia Community College, Long Island City, New York
Delaware Technical and Community College:
 Wilmington Campus, Wilmington, Delaware
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Pennsylvania
Erie Community College:
 North Campus, Buffalo (Amherst), New York
Georgian Court College, Lakewood, New Jersey
Glassboro State College, Glassboro, New Jersey
Hartwick College, Oneonta, New York
Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York
Howard University, Washington, D. C.
Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
Lock Haven State College, Lock Haven, Pennsylvania
Mater Dei College, Ogdensburg, New York
North Country Community College, Saranac Lake, New York
Philadelphia College of Art, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
St. Francis College, Brooklyn, New York
St. John Fisher College, Rochester, New York
St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Pennsylvania
Schenectady County Community College, Schenectady, New York
Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania
Spring Garden College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
State University of New York:
 Upstate Medical Center, Syracuse, New York
 Empire State College, Saratoga Springs, New York
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania
Towson State University, Towson, Maryland

Trinity College, Washington, D. C.
Trocaire College, Buffalo, New York
Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pennsylvania
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York
Wells College, Aurora, New York

ACCREDITATION AFFIRMED

University of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C.
Utica College of Syracuse University, Utica, New York (as a discrete institution)

GRANTED CANDIDATE FOR ACCREDITATION STATUS

Baptist Bible College and School of Theology, Clarks Summit, Pennsylvania
Centro de Estudios Avanzados de Puerto Rico Y El Caribe, San Juan, Puerto Rico
ICPR Junior College, Hato Rey, Puerto Rico
Pinebrook Junior College, Coopersburg, Pennsylvania

INSTITUTION CLOSED

St. Fidelis College, Herman, Pennsylvania

INSTITUTIONAL NAME CHANGES

Beacon College, Washington, D. C.
(formerly Campus-Free College)
Maryknoll School of Theology, Maryknoll, New York
(formerly listed as Maryknoll Seminary)
Panama Canal College, Canal Zone
(formerly Canal Zone College)
St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
(formerly St. Joseph's College)
Widener University, Chester, Pennsylvania
(formerly Widener College)

A year ago we thanked you for your confidence in including the Assembly of Elementary Schools as part of this Association. Today, we feel that your confidence was well founded. Within a year the Assembly has grown from its initial 20 pilot schools to 409 registrants.

Thirty-five of those schools have successfully completed the protocol and are now accredited. Twenty-one others have been certified, meaning that they have successfully completed the team visit of the accreditation protocol and may be accredited upon the development of a satisfactory action plan.

The four major projects that the Assembly of Elementary Schools has undertaken are as follows:

1. Development of Criteria

The Assembly of Elementary Schools has applied the philosophy of the Middle States Association, which holds that, while it maintains the unity of all schools, the Association considers the unique needs of the different groups of schools that make up its membership. For that reason, the Assembly's first major project was to establish a Committee for Public Schools, a Committee for Independent Schools, and a Committee for Religious Schools to examine the self-improvement process and to see in what ways that process had to be adjusted to meet the unique needs of each group.

These committees have now established criteria that meet the special needs of each of the three groups and have also established guidelines for using criteria which will make the self-improvement process more meaningful for the schools involved.

2. Multi-School Self-Study and Evaluation

The second major project of the Assembly has been the development of multi-school evaluations. We are proud to announce that the Assembly is working with Pittsburgh Public Schools Superintendent Jerry Olson, a recently elected member of the Board of Trustees of this Association, to evaluate simultaneously the 71 public elementary schools of the city of Pittsburgh under the direction of Associate Superintendent, Louise Brennen.

At the same time, we are developing multiple school evaluations for school districts where there are three or four schools such as there are in the Valley Stream Union Free School District in New York, and multiple school evaluations for school districts having from seven to ten elementary schools such as there are in Haverford and Upper Darby in Pennsylvania. The evaluation team visits these schools simultaneously.

Elinor R. Ford is Professor of Educational Policy and Administration at Fordham University at Lincoln Center in New York City. She has served as Superintendent of Schools of the Archdiocese of New York City and has been a member of the Association's Board of Trustees since 1975.

So we continue with the multi-school evaluation as we also move forward with single school evaluations such as that conducted under the leadership of Scott Cunningham and the Pingry Schools of Elizabeth, New Jersey.

3. Development of Training Materials

We are very happy, friends, about the progress of the Assembly of Elementary Schools in developing training materials for self-study leadership and team evaluators. In the future we will have several hundred elementary schools moving through various stages of the accreditation protocol. To support that process there is to be a publications trilogy, one of which is already out — *A Journey Through the Inner School* — developed by our Director, Dr. John A. Stoops.

In addition to that we are developing video tapes with a telephone hookup so that we can have immediate contact with schools in the self-study process; and, at the same time, train, in a consistent manner, those who will evaluate these schools.

4. Development of Membership

In view of our acceptance by the field, our membership may double before the next meeting. We feel that is due in large measure to the support of the Association membership, but it is also due to the support of the Trustees of Middle States, particularly under the leadership of Presidents Laurence, Sabo, and Kelly. It is also due to the tremendous workers who constitute the Executive Committee of the Assembly of Elementary Schools. But most of all it is due to the registered schools of the Assembly, the people in the elementary schools who really want their schools to be the best they can be.

I believe we are as far along as we are because we also have had the cooperation of both the Commission on Higher Education and the Commission on Secondary Schools, and most of all, because we have an extremely fine Director, Dr. John A. Stoops.

We are very pleased to be here; indeed, we are honored. In this moment I can give only a brief overview of the odyssey I have been on for the past four years. Starting out with the question of whether Middle States should extend its mission into the elementary schools, we had three basic problems:

1. The first was to satisfy the elementary school educators who perceived no particular need for elementary school accreditation, but were willing to approach the problem with an open mind. The growing enthusiasm for accreditation offers convincing evidence that elementary educators now perceive the opportunities inherent in accreditation.
2. The second problem was to satisfy the discerning public, upon whom so much depends, that elementary school educators could and should perform the fundamental responsibility that belongs to all professions, namely, to examine themselves to improve themselves and to control the development of quality in their schools. I need not say here again what has already been said so well by Dr. Bassin, that we are in a struggle to establish beyond any question that our profession of education, and not outsiders, are responsible for controlling the quality of the experiences offered by our schools and colleges. In this effort, we have made common cause with our colleagues in secondary and higher education. Progress has been slow, but there has been progress.
3. The third problem was to unify the elements of our profession, so unduly separated by the institution of collective bargaining procedures. To do this, we had to develop and introduce procedures which enabled administrators and teachers to work in unison on school improvements.

Over the four years the procedures have been developed. We have a lot of confidence in them, and with 409 schools, we are now engaged in training the educators who are going to use these procedures with integrity.

Now that elementary schools are members of the Middle States Association, it can be said that this Association is, in fact, the entire profession of education. Now, for the first time, everyone is here. It is an event of historic importance, one which equips us for events to come which will also be of historic importance.

It is appropriate, indeed, that we express gratitude to the MSA Presidents who have helped: Dr. Lawrence, Dr. Kelly, and now Dr. Sabo. Their statesmanship made this possible. I conclude my remarks by raising this tribute to them.

John A. Stoops is Director of the Assembly of Elementary Schools. He also directs the Institute for Educational Studies and Evaluation at Lehigh University where he is a Distinguished Professor of Educational Philosophy.

NEWLY ACCREDITED SCHOOLS

Archdiocese of Baltimore, Maryland

Arthur Slade Regional School, Glen Burnie
Immaculate Heart of Mary School, Baltimore
Mount Washington Country School for Boys, Baltimore
St. Margaret School, Bel Air
St. Michael School, Frostburg
St. Peter and St. Paul School, Cumberland
Trinity School, Ilchester

Cresskill Public Schools, New Jersey

Edward H. Bryan School
Merritt Memorial School

Eastern Lebanon County School District, Pennsylvania

Fort Zeller Elementary School
Jackson Elementary School
Myerstown Elementary School
Schaefferstown Elementary School

Franklin Lakes Elementary Schools, New Jersey

Colonial Road School
High Mountain Road School
Woodside Avenue School

Gill/St. Bernards School, New Jersey

Hendrick Hudson School District, New York

Buchanan-Verplanck School
Frank G. Lindsey School
Furnace Woods School
McKinley School

Mount Aviat Academy, Maryland

Norwood-Fontbonne Academy, Pennsylvania

Our Lady Queen of Peace School, Washington, D. C.

Pen Argyl School District, Pennsylvania

Plainfield Township Elementary School
Wind Gap Elementary School

Pingry Lower School, New Jersey

Readington Township Elementary Schools

Three Bridges School
Whitehouse School

Rockwood Area Elementary Schools, Pennsylvania

Sligo School, Maryland

Special Primary School No. 31, New York

Valley Stream U.F. School District, New York

Brooklyn Avenue School
Robert W. Carbonaro School
William L. Buck School
William F. Donahue School

Waldorf Elementary School, New York

NEWLY CERTIFIED SCHOOLS

Archdiocese of Baltimore Schools, Maryland

Mother Seton School, Emmitsburg
Our Lady of Perpetual Help School, Ilchester
Sacred Heart School, Glyndon
Saint Clement School, Lansdowne

Saint Dominics, Baltimore
Saint Luke School, Baltimore
Saint Mary's School, Cumberland
St. Patrick Elementary School, Cumberland
Haverford Township School District
Brookline Elementary School
Chatham Park Elementary School
Chestnutwold Elementary School
Cooperstown Elementary School
Lynnewood Elementary School
Manoa Elementary School
Oakmont Elementary School
Saint Catherline Laboure School, Maryland
Saint Jane Frances, de Chantal, Maryland

Report of the Committee on School and College Relations

MICHAEL J. REYNOLDS

I am very pleased to report to you this morning on the activities of the Committee on School and College Relations. The committee has continued to sponsor a series of five books that are currently in print. These are: *A Guide to Post-Secondary Articulation Programs in the Middle States*, which was developed as a cooperative undertaking with The College Board; a series of four volumes entitled *A Guide to Middle States Schools 1978-79*, revisions of earlier publications.

The *Guide* series has continued to be especially popular with college admissions officers, with almost half of total sales attributed to them.

The committee is also reviewing improved ways of publishing future editions of these books as well as new publications through the development of a mechanized data base system, and this approach should provide additional services to member institutions.

This year the committee assisted in the development of topics for the annual meeting, and is also sponsoring two workshops during the meeting.

The major elements of the Articulation Statement developed previously by the committee have found their way into the Articulation policies recommended by the Policy Advisory Committee on High School/College Articulation, sponsored by the State Department of Education and the State Board of Education in New Jersey.

I am particularly pleased that the Executive Directors of the Commissions and the Director of the Assembly of Elementary Schools regularly attend the meetings of the committee.

I am also pleased to announce that my successor Sally Higgins, Guidance Director at Seaford High School, Seaford, Delaware, together with the newly elected Vice Chairman, Joseph Klegman, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Middlesex County College, will continue to provide the quality of leadership that will permit the Committee on School and College Relations to accomplish its purposes.

In leaving this appointment I would like to express my personal appreciation to Calvin Crawford and to members of the committee for the good support and contributions that each has made during this past year.

Michael J. Reynolds is Assistant Vice Chancellor for University Planning for the State University of New York. He has been a member of the Association; Committee on School and College Relations, for the past six years and is its current Chairman.

President Sabo, colleagues: The member institutions of the Middle States Association have received the report of the Nominating Committee containing biographic information on each of the nominees. You also have before you a supplement to that report. At this time I wish to place in nomination the following:

For officers of the Association: For President, J. Harrison Morson; for First Vice President, Monsignor Francis B. Schulte; for Second Vice President, James S. Smoot; for Treasurer, John F. Zeller; for Immediate Past President, Joseph P. Sabo.

For membership on the Board of Trustees: Rollin P. Baldwin; Jerry C. Olson; Allan A. Kuusisto; Barbara R. Frey.

For a second term on the Board of Trustees: Margaret L. Murray.

For a second term on the Commission on Secondary Schools: Sister Mary Berchmans Hannan; Odette D. Harris; Marie P. Parnell; W. Cecil Short; Frank W. Thomas.

For membership on the Commission on Higher Education: Nancy N. Archer; Walton A. Brown; Weston L. Dean; Sister Colette Mahoney; Edward Arthur Trabant.

For a second term on the Commission on Higher Education: Milton G. Bassin; William H. Brown; J. L. Zwingle.

Mr. President, this report serves as a motion for adoption.

(The motion was seconded, put to a vote and carried.)

Margaret B. Kelly is Executive Vice President and Vice President for Academic Planning at St. John's University in New York City. She is a former member of the Association's Commission on Higher Education and has been on the Board of Trustees since 1975.

Mr. President, colleagues and guests. It is always a tense moment when the nominations are placed before you and you have the opportunity to nominate from the floor. I sometimes wonder if all of the carefully planned bureaucracy that takes place in a Nominating Committee could be thrown out of balance by someone who decides that there is a better candidate.

Although the rotation to the office of President of the Association is prescribed by the Bylaws, it has been my good fortune to have had the privilege and opportunity over the past five years to observe the leadership styles of five uniquely different but capable Presidents. Admittedly, during my earlier experience I was both awed and occasionally intimidated by the innate wisdom and dynamic personalities exhibited by several of these individuals. My closer working relationships with Presidents Kelly and Sabo, as well as the Executive Directors of the Association, of the Commissions, and of the Assembly of Elementary Schools have enhanced my confidence and sense of purpose as I assume the Board Presidency.

As we take this occasion during the course of our 93rd annual meeting to reflect and interact upon the activities of our Association and the increasing number of survival type issues pressing upon the educational scene in general, it becomes exceedingly apparent to me that the challenges confronting our Association are significant. Indeed several issues may be critical to our need to reorder the posture and profile of segments of the Association over the next several years.

Two years ago at the annual convention Association President Laurence promised me a principal role in the introduction of a new dues structure to enable us to sustain reasonable fiscal stability and autonomy. The Treasurer's report presented earlier confirms that this economic adjustment will become a reality by the close of 1980.

Sectors of our membership are seeking definitive recommendations and increased awareness of their particular need for additional options in the selection of assessment instruments and the size of teams assigned to fulfill the accreditation visitation process.

Discussions during a recent meeting in Amsterdam with our overseas affiliates revealed a perceived decrease in the degree of support and articulation which they feel are vital to the promotion of our mutual objectives.

Again on the home front the persistent, though often subtle incidence of state and federal intervention into the arena of voluntary accreditation remains an issue calling for our renewed surveillance. Some of you may recall that this subject was the theme of our 92nd annual convention.

The question of the geographical areas traditionally served by the regional associations has again surfaced, primarily with our colleagues west of the Mis-

J. Harrison Morson is Dean of Student Affairs at Union College in Cranford, New Jersey. For several years Mr. Morson was a member of and chaired the Association's Committee on School and College Relations. He has been a member of the Board of Trustees since 1977.

Mississippi. However, we have also witnessed a similar concern in behalf of our overseas membership.

Even as we focus our deliberations at this convention on the subject of outcomes, surely we must realize that we must resolve to demonstrate our professed level of educational quality through more quantitative measures which lay persons can easily interpret. In this period of increasing economic uncertainty we cannot expect our various publics to generate and provide the necessary resources without more tangible testimony of our performance as equated through outcomes.

And, finally, the enrollment and rapidly maturing stature of our Assembly of Elementary Schools signals our need to address its future organizational status.

If this agenda of concerns seems formidable and imposing I assure you it is. Moreover, it is not a checklist that can necessarily reach fruition under a fixed timetable.

As we ponder these Association issues I am mindful of and sensitive to the daily operating problems facing us at our own institutions. Decisions related to declining enrollment patterns, collective bargaining, personnel retrenchment, and budget restraints are but a few of the pressures that may cause us to question the extent to which we can also assume the burdens of Middle States.

My colleagues, I hasten to remind you that we are Middle States. We must not look to the Association only when we are preparing for some phase of the accreditation process. As insurmountable as our own institutional dilemmas may appear at times, the ultimate lifeline of this Association is our interdependency, our collective commitment to strengthening the image and promulgating the philosophy of voluntary accreditation. The responsibility for fulfillment of this mission rests squarely upon our shoulders.

We can evidence this commitment to the Association not only through direct service on the Board, the Commissions, the Assembly, and visitation teams. The Association through its Commissions and Assembly offers various outreach opportunities and responsibilities: case studies, subcommittees, special workshops, and conferences. There are occasionally invitations designed simply to solicit your candid reactions to the services publicized. Our annual convention generally provides such a forum.

Through my participation in Middle States I have come to believe firmly in the doctrines underlying the goals of this Association. More importantly, I am convinced that this agency of voluntary accreditation is vital to the assurance of quality and integrity in the educational institutions which we endorse.

Accepting the Presidency of our Association I can promise you nothing more during my term of office than a reaffirmation of my pledge to uphold our basic tenets and utilizing all the resources available to me I shall deal openly and candidly with the responsibilities and issues that come to my attention. To this end I earnestly seek your full support.

From the Depression to the Revolution

Luncheon Address

ABRAHAM H. LASS

I have never in my long and checkered career in the school system and outside the school system had the pleasure and privilege of speaking to this kind of aggregation of school people. I'm a big city animal and big city animals generally don't venture out into the suburbs very much. We have no credibility outside the big city. I don't think we understand it either. I don't think you understand us either, so that makes it even. And we perhaps perceive each other quite differently.

I don't come here with any solutions. I have no solutions, no breakthroughs, no guidelines. I don't even have any assessments and, strangely enough, according to the program I'm supposed to talk about assessments and outcomes. I can assure you I'm not sure about the assessments. I know one thing: I am an outcome. I'm an outcome like all of us, a product of my various moments of the past and reactions with the present.

I bring you myself. For some of you that may be a rather questionable gift, but that's all I have to bring you. And I bring you 41 years in the world's largest, most exciting, most frustrating school system.

Let me tell you a little bit about myself and then I'll tell you about what happened to me on the way to oblivion, which I think we're all destined for; and if I had my life to live over again or if I really had the chance, what I would do.

I was born in Brooklyn. I was raised in Brooklyn. I went to Brooklyn schools. I met my wife when she was 16 and I was 17. And, incidentally, though it's too late for most of you to take this advice, but in your next reincarnation, if you get a chance, meet your girl when she's 16 and you're 17 and fall in love and then marry her. It's the best time of all. It's the only time I ever really had, because it was all over when I was 17. I'm glad it was in a way. She died three years ago and life hasn't quite been the same. I am hoping that I will die in Brooklyn as I have lived in Brooklyn. I love it. It's not what it used to be, but then there is hardly anything that is what it used to be, including most of us here in this room.

My father landed in America from Russia in the early 1900s. He came here via steerage. I don't know whether any of you know what that is, but there is a famous Alfred Steiglitz picture of steerage. It was the only way he could have gotten here. He came with the clothes on his back and his prayer shawl and prayer book and a few cents in his pocket, and that's it. He came to escape poverty, extinction, discrimination, and everything else.

He came to find what America had promised him, as it promised everybody else, freedom, peace, dignity, and opportunity. He raised his family here and we all got the same kind of chance that he got. I was the first one, the oldest.

These days everybody has become very ethnic, as you know. There are no

Abraham H. Lass is the former principal of Abraham Lincoln High School in the Coney Island section of Brooklyn, New York. He has written widely on the college admissions process and has authored several anthologies of literature.

more Americans; they're all hyphenated Americans. When I went to school we were just supposed to become Americans and let our parents take care of the ethnic part. Now the schools are trying to do all of these things at once and are obviously, as you know, not succeeding very well. Each ethnic group has its own set of values and among the Jewish people being a doctor is it. For many reasons I was slated to become a doctor. I didn't know about it, but I was.

When I was in the school system the Regents examinations were given in the state in English, and we used to collect the kids' boners that they wrote under great stress. Of course, as you know, the first thing that gives way under stress is the English sentence, which for many of these kids was not in particularly good shape even before the stress. But if you have to write an examination paper on which your graduation hangs, the sentences become very, very shaky.

We used to collect these at the end and they were a source of great amusement for us and also some consolation. We felt that all the stupid people were not in the faculty, that there were some among the students. A great consolation.

One Jewish boy, a senior, wrote, "After you are born you can relax for the first five years. After you've reached the age of five your parents decide you're going to be a doctor."

That had great personal poignancy for me. I didn't become a doctor. I found that you had to know too much that was irrelevant, and so I decided to become a teacher. It didn't pay as well, but it was easier. I didn't have any house calls to make, which was one of the things that doctors had to do in those days.

When I entered school I was monolingual. I spoke only Yiddish at the age of five, which was not very strange since that's all I heard at home from my mother and my father and my grandfather and grandmother, and most of the kids around me. But they were not sending Yiddish report cards home in those days, so I had to learn English and I did. At the end of five months I not only learned it, but I was able to teach it to my mother and father, who never spoke it quite accurately but we understood each other.

My recollection of those days when I was going to elementary school is that all the teachers were called Miss McDonald or Miss McGregor, or something like that. Historically, as you know, New York City is the portal to America for various immigrant groups that passed through the school system. This was a period that was dominated by the Christians, if I may say that — there is no other way to put it.

We were all immigrant kids — Italians, Poles, Germans. The only thing we had in common was that we didn't like the teachers, which was a great thing to have in common. We all had a feeling that they didn't like us, didn't like us because we weren't Americans. But the teachers, as I recall them, had a passion about making us Americans and they succeeded. The result was that we managed to grow up speaking the language with some degree of proficiency without any bilingual programs.

I don't know whether that touches a responsive chord any place around here, but just for a second let me comment on the bilingual program. I'm not coming back to it because I'm taking the next Amtrak out. But this is the first time in recorded history that any country had devoted a considerable portion of its treasury, sub-

stance, and personnel to making some kids illiterate in two languages. This has never happened before.

I argue with my friends who head up these programs and I ask them, "How is it that I was able to learn English? My parents didn't know any. The teachers were able to teach me. Why can't they teach the Hispanic kids? Are you trying to tell me that Hispanic kids are inferior to Jewish kids or Italian kids or Russian kids? I don't believe that."

At any rate, I have an armed guard ready for me on the way out. But it's a real question in my mind and a lot of other people's minds — whether this approach to a very serious problem, which is not terribly different from what the schools had in the early 1900s, is a viable one. Instead of having Hispanics or Haitians they had Jews and Italians and others who also had language problems. Apparently they felt that by not paying attention to them the language problems would go away, and apparently they did. And they managed to raise a generation of writers and doctors and lawyers and everything else without it. So the question arises in my mind why we can't do it today.

I span a very interesting period in the history of the city. I entered the school system in 1931 — in the depression — and I left it in 1971, roughly. It was pretty rough from '68 to '71. From the depression to the end of the revolution. It was a school system that weathered World War Two, Vietnam, Korea, etc.

I became a teacher not because I was dedicated. I never thought of myself as being dedicated, and I'm glad I didn't. I was pretty insufferable without being dedicated, my wife used to tell me. I taught kids because I loved them, and I think that's the only and best reason for going into teaching. Otherwise you can't stand them if you don't love them.

I loved teaching in the city schools better than any other kinds of schools because basically I was a city kid myself and I had a feeling for these kids in the school system since I was brought up on the city streets. Do I sound it? Yes, I do. It does something to you. You learn compassion the right way. You learn understanding the right way, not from a book.

It's the only school system that is all-encompassing and all-embracing. It teaches the gifted, the hostile, and even now the illegals. It was a good place to be and it was a man's job, not a woman's job. I mean it was a job that a man could do and could be proud of.

The schools when I was growing up, and when I was in them too, represented something very special to the kids. It was a place where you began to find yourself and it was a place where you learned the things you never dreamed of and where you discovered and developed your talents, a place where you opened up your mind and your heart and confronted the overwhelming issue of the present.

Up until recent times it was universally recognized that the school was the American way out of ignorance and poverty and into the mainstream of American life. I am, I hope, a testament to that.

It's true that some of the kids never made it, never made it out of the intellectual and physical slums that they were in. They couldn't shake off the crippling influence into which they were born, and the schools couldn't reach them in time.

But despite these obvious and transient failures to do something important for all the kids, the school was still regarded as an intrinsic and indispensable part of the American experience. Unfortunately by some of our critics it is no longer so regarded. They want vouchers instead.

It taught millions of kids to read, to write, and what we used to call to cipher. It was convinced that its kids were well taught, that they didn't necessarily have to be humored, entertained, conned, cajoled, bribed, or wheedled into mastering what they would have to know for the rest of their lives. The schools taught the kids something about their history and their traditions, and taught them very directly and systematically to respect themselves and to treat their fellowmen with respect. They taught them compassion for the elderly, for the weak, the helpless, and the hopeless.

The school also taught the kids good old-fashioned courtesy, something that the present members of the love generation seem not to have learned. The schools were also sanctuaries. They were safe. They were safe to be in and safe to learn in.

I couldn't have become a principal, incidentally, in any other city except New York. My religion, my point of view, the fact that I have a big mouth and occasionally shoot it off where I shouldn't — all that would have made it impossible for me to become a principal in those days. But fortunately it was an open school system. It was a school system run by merit, and on that merry-go-round everybody had a chance at the golden ring. You could get it — if not the first time, then the second or third time around. And when you got it you owed nobody anything, nobody except the children that you were entrusted with. You didn't need to go to the club house; you could make it on your own. That's what the exam said. No monkeying around with politicians and no wheedling, nothing. You could lead a clean, honest, courageous life.

That's not true any more. That merit system through which I came and thousands of my fellows came no longer exists. I'm not too sure I know what has taken its place, but whatever it is it is getting a bunch of frightened people, and frightened people can't lead.

Time has a way of running. I thought I was going to have a nice leisurely time to reminisce with you over what life was like in the good old days, but it's not going to be that way; so I'm going to have to throw half of this speech away. I feel very much like the speaker who was invited by a parents association. After he finished his speech he shook hands and they said, "We will send you what we were going to send you." And they sent him a watch.

The package felt rather light. He opened it and noticed there was nothing in it. He called the President and said, "Did you make a mistake?"

"Oh, no, not at all. We're having you back next year and then we'll give the works!"

I'll be back.

Let me tell what characterized the schools up until the late '60s. The late '60s was a turning point — a big teachers strike in '68.

These were basically schools that agreed upon what they were doing, who was

taking whom where and for what reasons. This was a predictable system. We used to say in those days when teachers' salaries weren't so high that you were sure you would starve steady — no question about it — but you knew that if you behaved yourself and didn't commit any immoral acts in the front hall you would be able to run your whole life around that school system. It's not that predictable any more.

A great many teachers and supervisors no longer have tenure. I don't know what your feeling is about tenure, but I will tell you mine since that is what I have been invited here to tell you. I don't think a school system can run without tenure, or run well without it. I don't think you can be the kind of supervisor you should be if you don't have the minimum protection that will allow you to do the things that you want to do and say the things you feel you must say. Very few of us are martyrs. Very few of us are going to lay down our lives, our professional lives, simply for the luxury of saying something that we think should be said, and which means that our kids don't go to college and that we don't have a job. That's just not the way things work. There are no more martyrs in teaching than there are in any other professions.

The schools of that time were very peaceful. You did not have to be afraid to go into them.

Then came the great strike of 1968. I think many of you were around at the time. I wish I could go into it because it was the great event of my life. Sixty thousand teachers and a million kids were out for about two months, and all the hostilities and tensions of a large city came to the surface — all the anti-Jewish, anti-Christian, anti-black, anti-white — you name it — all these things that lie below the surface of what appears to be an almost seamless fabric broke out into the open; and I say with the assistance of the Ford Foundation and McGeorge Bundy and the idiotic Mayor Lindsay.

The school system and the city have never been the same, never. I stayed on from '68 until '71. By that time things had gotten quieter, but the scars I think — I know — are deep and I believe almost irradicable.

There is a moral to that story, I suppose. Don't let the Ford Foundation run your school system. This is something we found out. I think there is a member of the Ford Foundation here and I want to apologize to them. I have tenure, so I don't have to worry about it. In the old days when I didn't have tenure I had to be very careful, because otherwise I might not get a grant.

What is it like today? I have been out of the schools now for nine years and I don't think anybody is really qualified to speak about any institution if he's been away that long. I've been away physically, and if you're away that long you do lose the feel. There is no substitute. Even when you are in a school — there are various kinds of principals: There are the setters who are always in their office and there the predators, the wanderers, that you find in the boys room and in your closets and all over. But these are the guys, incidentally, who know what it's all about.

I'm not implying that everything that it's all about is in the boys room, but it's a very educational place to know about.

Teaching as I see it now has become a hazardous profession — maybe not in your town, but certainly throughout the country. These are rather recent statistics.

More than 25% of the nation's 2.1 million teachers have suffered some sort of property damage, and more than 110,000 — 1 in 20 — have been physically attacked in the year 1978-79. One-third of them say they wouldn't enter if they were beginning now, and thousands are leaving.

We have a new kind of phenomenon in teaching — maybe it hasn't touched you yet — and it's called the burnt-out teacher. It's like the battered wife. These are the depressed, run down. They need psychiatric care. It would have been unthinkable in my day.

The school is no longer an object of an adoration or even toleration. It's an object of contempt, an object of hostility — sometimes concealed, sometimes not so well concealed. Neither the teachers nor the supervisors feel safe, as safe as they used to.

Mind you, I am talking from the big city point of view. I realize that there are little havens here and there — maybe more havens — but the big cities are in terrible, terrible difficulties. The principal is, as he always has been, the eye of the hurricane. He is in a no-win position. He's caught between the parents and the union and the students and the Board of Education, the politicians and the courts. He has to preside over and manage and persuade and guide and inspire.

I got this all out of a book, incidentally; I didn't make it up. Some guy wrote this who had never been a principal.

And while the principal is trying to pacify all these people they're tearing him to pieces. The school is being asked to pick up society's marbles. All the things that society can't solve are dumped on the school door, and the schools have not only willingly accepted them but they have also accepted the blame for not being able to solve the insoluble.

The curriculum is pretty much in disarray, except perhaps for mathematics and the sciences. Otherwise nobody really knows what he is doing, particularly in my own native English. Nobody knows what they're doing or nobody knows what he or she is doing, whichever you prefer.

The thing that bothers me is that kids now believe that unless it's fun you shouldn't do anything with it. Learning has to be a continuous ecstasy. Nothing else in life is like that, but it's only learning that has to be like that. It's a sort of eight-year orgiastic experience.

The realities are, of course, quite the reverse. Most of what you have to learn is pretty uninteresting for the most part and it's difficult, and if you don't know it you're going to grow up to be illiterate and you won't be able to function. But the schools don't tell that to the kids. Instead they do other things.

I'd like to read you something out of the August 30, 1976 Newsweek. It's written by a Maro Wilinsky, a free lance writer.

"The idea of permissive education appealed to my mother in 1956 when she was a Bohemian and I was four. In Greenwich Village she found a small private school whose beliefs were hers and happily enrolled me. I know it was an act of motherly love, but it might have been the worst thing she ever did to me.

"This school — I'll call it Sand and Sea — attracted other such parents,

upper middle-class professionals, who were determined not to have their children pressured the way they had been. Sand and Sea was a school without pain and it was the kind of school that the back-to-basics people rightly fear most.

"I soon became an exemplar of educational freedom, the freedom not to learn. During my own high school years the school psychologist was baffled by my lack of substantive knowledge. He suggested to my mother that I be given a battery of psychological tests to find out why I was blocking out information. The thing was I wasn't blocking because I didn't have any information to block.

"Most of my Sand and Sea classmates were also enduring the same kind of hardships that accompany severe handicaps. My own reading comprehension was in the lowest, 8th, percentile. Not surprising, I was often asked by teachers how I had gotten into high school. However, I did manage to stumble not only through high school, but also through college — first in junior college, then rejected by all four-year colleges and then New York University, hating it all the way as I had been taught to. I am still amazed that I have a B.A., but I think of it as a B.S.

"And now I have come to see that the real job of school is to entice the student into the web of knowledge and then if he is not enticed to drag him in. I wish I had been."

I have a few minutes to talk about the way it's supposed to be — if I were king. When I started to teach the first poem I taught was to a group of 14-year olds. It came from a little brown book, appropriately. It was "The Shorter Poems of Robert Browning." He never wrote short poems — that was a misnomer — and most of his poetry was impenetrable. I was 23 and the kids were 14, and the first poem I taught was "Rabbi Ben Ezra," which begins as follows:

"Grow old along with me;
The best is yet to be."

Neither one of us had any idea what was coming up, but of all things to be teaching a group of 14-year olds! Now I could teach it and I could tell them something about what is in store.

But I also taught them other things and one of them was The Rubaiyat, which got to be my favorite poem. The lovely verse that comes from it is the sort of thing I used to moon over — if I was ever in a position to found my own school!

Ah, love! Could you and I with him conspire
To grasp this sorry scheme of things entire,
Would not we shatter it to bits — and then
Remold it nearer to the heart's desire.

I suppose we'd all like to do that.

I'm at the end now and the best part of the speech I'm going to have to come back and give you some other time — and that's the Abe Lass High School, that would be nearer my heart's desire.

Briefly, it's a school in which the principal and the teachers get the dignity and the security that they deserve, and in which the teacher is not asked to do anything

other than to teach — which in itself should win anybody a Nobel Prize, anybody who can really teach the way you're supposed to teach.

But in addition the teacher is in charge of learning disabilities and in charge of everything else. He's a warden and everything else but a teacher.

In my school everybody would learn to read because I believe deep, deep inside that anybody who is not brain damaged or terribly distraught emotionally can be taught to read. I don't buy this business that the kids in the ghettos can't be taught to read because the families are upset, or whatever. The families may be upset, but if you run a school the way I would run my school there would be at least one place where the kids would have a chance, the only chance out of the prison of illiteracy — the school, where they would learn to read. In our society if you can't read you're a prisoner, a prisoner in such a fundamental sense that I never realized it until after I retired.

After I retired I spent seven months at Rikers Island prison. Some of my friends thought it was too long delayed! If you have never had the experience of having a total illiterate suddenly take a look at a page and have that page mean something, you really don't know what an experience it can be.

I don't believe that kids do not want to learn to read. I just don't believe that. I think they can't and among the reasons that they can't is that there are too many teachers who do not know how to teach reading.

There are hundreds in our city who can't teach reading, and the remedial reading specialist is no substitute for the loving teacher who sees the kid every day. I don't think you need too many tricks. I was not a reading specialist, but I taught prisoners to read in prison. There may be some metaphor there — I don't know, but maybe it's a good place to start. Put each kid in a cell and you can teach him to read!

I would also be sure to keep out of the school the kids who can't function in school. I don't want to go into that too much now because it's going to get me into difficulties. I believe that there are some kids for whatever reason it may be — and I don't know what all the reasons are — who just can't hack it in school any more. Either they are emotionally disturbed or distraught, and they do not belong in the school as you and I understand the school, with a teacher and 30 kids. You can't teach in that kind of class.

I remember that I needed only one kid in one class to make it impossible for me to teach. Most people think you have to have a lot of such kids. No. One kid per class. If you have five classes, five kids — and you're lucky you get home with a whole skin.

I want to say something nice about the schools lest you think I'm down on the schools. If I had my life to live over again I would really go back to teaching. I'd go back a little more carefully than I did before, but I think I'd go back because I think that's what I was made for. I'd go back to teaching in prison where people really appreciate you for what you're doing for them.

I think we should all stand up and give three cheers for these great schools of ours all over. There is no place in the world, no place in the world, where anybody has done as much for as many people, or tried to do as much. Of course, trying to educate all the children of all the people — the poor and the rich, and the disadvan-

tagged, and the lame and the blind — poses the kinds of problems that no other society has ever confronted. So obviously if we're not doing too well it's because we're trying to do what nobody else has ever done before.

We aren't failing everybody. I don't believe that. Jesse Jackson put it that there are a great many people who are waiting for the schools to fail and the schools have fallen victim to what he calls the illusion of inevitability.

We're carrying a lot more than we should be carrying as schools. We're carrying society's burdens. And not only that. We're taking on new ones, and every time they give us a new one we say "thank you." Nobody gets up and says, "Enough. We're only teachers. We're not wardens. We're not specialists. We're not anything except teachers. Let us teach and don't shove your problems off on us." The profession as a whole doesn't stand up and say that.

I'd like to end on a somewhat lighter note, although this all hasn't been too heavy I know. I loved being a teacher and I loved being a chairman and I even liked being a principal — in that order. If they paid me enough I would have stayed in the classroom. I had to get out of the classroom because I had two kids and a wife. Our schools are inverted pyramids, and if you want to make more money you have to go into administration. It's a horrible truth, but that's it. Those who do the most get paid the least. I'm talking personally, from the principal's point of view. And that does not include anybody in this room.

I loved teaching in the schools. I love kids for what they are and for what they could do and what they could do to you. I'd like to share with you two of my choicest recollections, both on Regents examinations.

One kid wrote: "Sweet are the joys of infancy, but they're nothing compared with those of adultery." Out of the mouths of babes.

Another kid wrote: "Queen Elizabeth was called the virgin queen. As a queen she was a great success." This is called rewriting history.

I would like to share with you my favorite passage in literature. It's from Sean O'Casey, who unfortunately is not too much read these days. It's not from one of the major works, but it's from an article he wrote shortly before he died for the *Atlantic Monthly*.

"No one passes through life scatheless. The world has many sour noises and the body is an open target for many invisible enemies — all hurtful, some venomous, full of disappointments — a world that aches bitterly 'til our time here ends. Yet even so, each of us, one time or another, can ride a white horse, can have rings on our fingers and bells on our toes, and if we keep our senses open to the scents, sounds, and sights all around us we shall have music wherever we go."

I've had a lifetime of this kind of music and I want to thank you for letting me share it.

Testing the Test — A New Era in Assessment

General Session Address

GEORGE H. HANFORD

I would like to remind those of you who may have forgotten that the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, as you were known back in 1900, was one of the founding spirits of The College Board, along with twelve colleges, three of which — Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, and Bryn Mawr — are nearby.

Some of my important concerns as the newly appointed President of The College Board are similar to those that faced the founders of the organization at the turn of the century, and they are closely related to the conference theme you've been exploring these past two days: how to measure and assess human ability; how to help individuals and institutions involved in various assessments and transitions — help people in their transitions from school to college, from college to graduate study, from education to work, and, for many adults, back again.

Today we are together testing the tests — tests of various kinds given at various levels of education to suit various purposes. While I don't really believe there is a war on testing, I do know that we're involved in the most active scrutiny of tests that I've seen during my thirty-five years as a professional educator.

For the professionals and oldtimers among us this scrutiny and the criticism aren't really new. For some, however, I suspect it is a new encounter, with new intensity and new players, including students and consumer advocates, legislators and even the ubiquitous man or person in the street John Q. or Jane Q. Public, who seems somehow to be developing a strange love/hate relationship with tests these days.

On the one hand more and more states are establishing minimum competency laws and standards, and then assuming that they're going to be enforced through tests. On the other hand, the legislatures in some of those same states are responding to the call by a leading teachers organization for a moratorium on the use of tests and to Ralph Nader's call for their abolition.

In a recent and very perceptive commentary on testing, psychologist and lawyer Barbara Lerner suggests that tests are under attack today because they tell us truths about ourselves and our society — partial truths, to be sure, but truths nonetheless.

Harry Truman, you may recall, during his 1948 whistle-stop campaign said he didn't "give 'em hell" at all, but told the truth, and people thought he was giving them hell.

Dr. Lerner elucidates the further truths being revealed: "the even more unwelcome ones about the relationship between intellectual competence and national productivity, and about the price we pay for incompetence in an increasingly

George H. Hanford is President of the College Board. Appointed to that position in September of this year, his earlier responsibilities with that organization have included Executive Vice President, Vice President for Administration and Programs, Assistant Treasurer and Treasurer.

competitive world market."

Having personally worked closely with the panel that was chaired by Willard Wirtz on the decline in SAT scores, I would note that its findings bear out her observations, for the decline in the scores reflects complex problems in our schools and in society, problems that are a hell of a lot more complex than the simple 3-digit SAT score.

But it's that decline, I am convinced, that is at the heart of the campaign to regulate testing through legislation — "truth in testing" as it is cleverly misnamed — and is responsible for its most troublesome feature, the requirement that the test items be disclosed after they are given. Unlimited test disclosure may be a form of satisfaction and gratification to some students, though I suspect not too many will seek it, but I believe that the short or long range educational benefits to individuals or institutions will be very limited and certainly not worth the cost to all involved.

A Connecticut newspaper editorial recently put it this way: "The basic faults in both education and social environment will not be remedied by access to answers. Individual answers on the SAT or similar tests are far less relevant than overall mastery and comprehension of subject, which is what tests are all about."

Dr. Lerner goes on to point out: "We all want to be the judges of our own competence and we all are to some extent. No one questions our right to be that. The only real question is whether any of us also have the right to be the sole judges of our own competence, and the answer is no, not if we value truth and want to stay in touch with external reality."

What I would like to do for the next few minutes this morning is to discuss some of the distortions that keep being generated about tests and try to enlist your help in mounting a campaign to tell the truth about testing in this country, for the current moves toward legislative control of testing are bound adversely to affect your schools or your colleges.

Let me begin with a few simple truths and you will, I trust, understand if I use the context I know best. The College Board, which is not now and never has been an industry or even a business. We are, as many of you who are constituent members know, an educational association, accountable to our trustees, to our membership, to the IRS, and to others. We are not, despite popular belief, the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey, though we did help found it and have a contract for services with it open to public scrutiny. Nor are we the American College Testing program in Iowa City either.

We don't operate in secrecy, exist in a vacuum, conspire behind closed doors, as is being charged. In a given year hundreds of teachers and administrators like you are involved in the Board's advisory councils, and student representatives now sit on all our major committees. All these volunteers — and I see many in this room — are part of The College Board family, working together on problems of admissions and financial aid. They-you-we play a key role in the definition and maintenance of educational standards, which I would remind you is a charter function of The College Board, a role that should be played, it seems to me, from within education and within our organization and not mandated from outside by some external agency or government regulation.

You and I are not, as Ted Fiske recently pointed out in *The New York Times Sunday Magazine*, part of a "giant assembly line of the mind where ideas and facts are the raw materials and the final product is a credential." I know Ted well and his words have a nice ring, I admit, but they simply are not so. His article is only one of the many that have picked up and repeated the incomplete and misleading allegations about the SAT, so let me pause here for a moment in the City of Brotherly Love and do a little exorcism.

The SAT, he notes, does not measure imagination, stamina, creativity, or such qualities as compassion, empathy, and humane values. And he is, I admit, entirely correct. But please note that the SAT does not measure also height or weight, skin color, geographic location, or economic status. As we all know, it wasn't designed to do any of those things, never was, is not, and never will be.

What, then does, it do? For those of you who don't know, concisely put, the SAT offers a national yardstick of student ability regardless of school, class, curriculum, family background, or other variables. It is much more versatile, useful, objective, and, I honestly believe, fairer than any other single mechanism I know for assessing human talents and abilities. Nothing else over a 50-year span has given us a better understanding of the underlying factors involved in the human cognitive experience.

We think that — and this is an important qualification — until and unless new techniques and procedures are developed, the disclosure provisions of the legislation that has been enacted in New York and is being proposed elsewhere may well pose a serious threat to the long-range viability and quality of the SAT and tests like it, and consequently may diminish its usefulness to all of you whether in schools or colleges.

This test is only a tool and it's only one of many used by admissions officers and committees, and certainly it is not the most important one. Indeed its importance is on the wane, along with other instruments that are used in selection in an era when we're moving toward admissions that are more open. That's why we are at The College Board moving toward and preparing for a time when there will be a much greater need for testing tools useful in earlier guidance, in placement, and assessment for remedial purposes, tools (for a brief commercial) like our new tests of developed mathematical and language abilities.

A recent survey that we conducted in conjunction with AACRAO puts the role of tests in clear perspective in the admissions process. This survey of a majority of the nation's colleges and universities about current and future admissions plans and practices reinforces what all experienced practitioners among us already know: that tests are useful and important, but in no way do they dominate the selection and admissions process. In fact, the survey shows that less than 2% of even the most selective colleges regard tests as the single most important factor in admissions.

Two speakers at our recent national forum in New Orleans touched upon important elements in the controversy over testing. One, former U.S. Commissioner of Education Ernie Boyer, urged a closer alignment and a better understanding between those who teach and those who test. And let me come back to that in just a second.

One of the things that Dr. Boyer said to me at dinner the night before is that we at The College Board have put great emphasis on the fact that the SAT is curriculum-free. And you will remember, if you were listening earlier, that I made that point. But his point is that we have stressed this so hard and talked about it so much that we have begun to sound as though we were saying — and certainly people out there in the real world are beginning to think that what we have been saying is that it is schooling-free. And it isn't. The verbal and mathematical abilities measured by the SAT are terribly based on what instruction students get. It's curriculum-free, but not school-free.

As I said, Dr. Boyer was suggesting a closer alignment between those who teach and those who test. Certainly no one can argue with this, not even the arch enemy of standardized tests, the NEA, which was, ironically now, among the founders of The College Board, along with Middle States.

The second speaker was William Raspberry, the Washington Post columnist and observer of the American scene. He admonished our audience as gatekeepers to do a better and more responsible job of monitoring test use and of informing the public about the roles and limitations of various tests. Here again, I agree with his charge and hope that this is an area in which we can enlist your support both in assuring the proper use of tests by educators and, equally important, in informing the public about the nature and utility of tests as well as their limitations.

Secrecy is another shibboleth of critics. You may recall an article in the *Village Voice*, of all places, which used a picture taken down at ETS focusing narrowly through a heavy chain-link fence and suggesting security measures akin to those of the military and intelligence communities. Of course, some testing involves procedures for safeguarding individual and institutional data, rights, materials, and information. But those measures of care, responsibility, and efficiency should not be confused, as they sometimes are, with allegations of secrecy about what tests do, how they are constructed, or how results are interpreted and used.

By contrast we, your institutions and The College Board, you and I, have really been moving steadily to open up the admissions and the examination processes. When I joined The College Board staff in 1955 students were not allowed to know their SAT scores and the thought of letting them have a look at a sample copy of the SAT was unthinkable, but by 1960 scores were being released to students and we were well into the business of explaining what they meant, a business which has led us inevitably to the publication of a full copy of the SAT.

By the same token the thought of colleges revealing their scores — the scores, that is, of the students who apply to and are accepted by them — the thought of colleges revealing their scores was even more unthinkable. Yet today the publication of freshman class profiles revealing score experiences is an accepted practice.

Quite frankly, I had intended at this point to indulge in a reasoned and extended recital of all the things The College Board does, all the volumes we publish, the films we make, the open meetings we hold, the research we do, the data we reveal — all the things we do to reveal and explain what The College Board does, because I frankly get fed up with critics who are either lazy or don't read. The problem is I realize that saying things like that with vehemence is liable to get me into

hot water. But, like Chesterton said, I believe in getting into hot water because it keeps you clean. In any event, that lengthy recital is in the copy of what it is I'm saying if anybody should take the trouble to ask for a copy of what it was I said.

I'll spare you that three-minute commercial and go on with the observation that secrecy isn't the only complaint of the mis- or uninformed proponents of legislation to regulate testing. Incidentally, while I'm on the subject of complaints I would remind the historians among you that Edmund Burke once noted that it is a popular error to suppose that the loudest complainers for the public are the most anxious for its welfare.

This other complaint about tests has to do with their validity. The reasoning by the proponents of legislation to regulate testing is that if tests were regularly and routinely disclosed after each use this act would somehow expose their alleged weaknesses and lead somehow to their improvement.

In truth, since we are attempting to bring out some truths about testing, a great many studies over the years by colleges and by others have demonstrated the validity of the good old SAT to carry out its original and continuing and only purpose: to help predict how students are going to do academically in college.

The Mental Measurements Yearbook has, for instance, in its reviews of the SAT by outside experts characterized it as the best ever developed, one of the best. But it isn't perfect, nor a completely accurate predictor. Yet, when you can put it with school grades they together provide the best predictor known. Like it or not, the ability to reason verbally and mathematically continues to be essential to academic success.

Finally, let me come to the thorny issue of tests and government regulation. We've all heard or contributed to the recent rhetoric on this subject, and I don't need to review for this audience the developments of the past year which culminated in the enactment of the LaValle bill in New York and the introduction in Congress of proposed legislation to regulate tests nationally.

We are by no means done with the issue. Bills are pending in several states, Pennsylvania and New Jersey among them. A recent analysis by Robert Braun in the Newark Star Ledger suggests that if the New Jersey proposal passes it could mean the end of all accountability programs in that state, not only those that assess the competence of teachers, but also, as Chancellor Hollander points out, the state's new college-level basic skills tests.

And so a ripple effect begins — California legislation for limited disclosure, New York — a little more full disclosure, Washington — fuller disclosure including achievement tests, the New Jersey bill — including all tests. Where's it going to end? Bar examination? Civil service examination? Driving tests?

I've got a speech on societal values and academic standards with which I will not stimulate you this morning, but you can divine its punch line. A nation that throws out its tests, as Ralph Nader would have us do, is in danger of throwing out both its values and its standards.

The other serious ripple effect has to do with government intervention per se and its intrusion into the educational process. As I told our annual business meeting in New Orleans earlier this fall, I am apprehensive about this development for sev-

eral reasons, but primarily because I believe that government intrusion into admissions testing programs and hence into the admissions process itself is uncalled for, and not worth the price to all involved — students, institutions and ultimately society.

The emerging legislation, be it state or federal, threatens to impede the historic and hard-won goals of equalizing educational opportunity, and represents yet another step by government into the hallways of education, an intervention that has been characterized by some legislators as dealing only with the tip of the iceberg of higher education.

Make no mistake about it, please. This testing of the tests that I've been talking about this morning could be only a part, a beginning, if you will, of the testing of education.

I realize that would be a very somber note on which to leave you, so I won't. I'll leave you instead with the message I gave to our membership, and I apologize to those who heard it. I quoted James Russell Lowell: "Mishaps are like knives that help us or hurt us as we grasp them by the handle or by the blade."

I look on legislation as a knife, and I trust you'll join me, us, The College Board, in the hunt for handles. I honestly believe that we can turn this public scrutiny into testing into an opportunity, an opportunity to demonstrate the value of education and the importance of standards. Government attention, after all, to minorities, the rights of minorities, of women, and the handicapped has, after all, gotten us in education to accelerate our agendas in these regards. The spotlight on testing can do the same thing for us when we manage to find the right handle.

If there were to be a punch line to these remarks — which there won't be — that would have been it, but as you may or may not know I agreed to answer questions if you want to ask me any. To give you time then to think up yours let me ask you mine:

1. What are the viable alternatives to tests for admission?
2. How much does your institution rely on tests and test scores in the guidance process if you represent a school or in the admissions process if you represent a college?
3. Should we — and, if so, how could we — your schools and colleges as institutions or the Middle States Association and The College Board as organizations — better respond to the concerns of the consumer movement?
4. Should we be — and, if so, how can we all become more accountable. Or, perhaps, how can we bring about a better perception of our accountability?
5. Can there be standards without assessment?
6. What is the minimum? Where is the floor?

We may very well face the situation so well described by William Saroyan's philosophical commentator in his *The Time of Your Life* who repeats throughout the play the troubling reminder that there is no foundation all down the line.

Assembly of Elementary Schools

Breakfast Address

BARBARA R. FREY

This meeting represents a significant milestone on a roadway we have been traveling for a long time. Indeed, the Regents of the State of New York have now approved the amendment to the charter of the Middle States Association to include the accreditation of elementary schools, then, in its mission. This does recognize untiring efforts of people over many years, many members of the Middle States Association, its officers, Board members, committee participants, school officials, concerned educators, and, most assuredly, those principals and teachers who were in the pilot schools.

In our efforts to reach this milestone I am sure we often shared the frustration of the tourist seeking to reach a small town in the state of Vermont. After several rather non-productive starts the traveler stopped to ask the natives the way to get to his desired destination. In typical Vermont style a long pause resulted in the deliberative statement: "Well, I reckon you can't get there from here."

We felt that way sometimes, but where there is a will there is a way, and there was a will and it was shared by many, and we did get here from there.

I'd like to briefly review some of the hurdles and obstacles and achievements which culminated in today's success. It began early with the confirmation that the accreditation of elementary schools was an important and desirable task. There were committees formed five and six years ago to look at this question and other committees to confirm it, and, finally, confirmation.

It was also affirming that if it was a task which should be done it should be done by those people most closely involved, and that it must actively involve and be the responsibility of the elementary schools themselves. On that we stood.

Finally, it was determined that the process of accreditation of an elementary school must lead to continuing improvement in the education of children. This is at once an awesome and a thrilling challenge which must continue to guide us from where we are to where we want to be.

After all, every year hundreds of thousands of individuals are committed to educational institutions for six to nine years. This mandate carries with it a very serious responsibility, and it's often difficult to fulfill the expectations which are implied. One of the reasons for that is that elementary schools are particularly vulnerable. We have a captive audience. We are close to the people. We're kind of the last vestige of local control. Basically elementary schools are presumed to belong to the adults in that community, the children are too young to take over. But this places on us a responsibility and expectation to do many, many things.

Barbara R. Frey is Vice President for Academic Affairs at the State University College of Arts and Sciences in Buffalo, New York. A member of the Assembly's Executive Committee, Dr. Frey was, at this meeting, elected to a three year term on the Board of Trustees.

It has been said that in the current era of decline it may be especially necessary for schools to help the public keep its expectations more consistent with the ability of the school to do the tasks and do them well. Looking at our elementary schools, I think we may be helped to do this.

When we determined that the process of elementary school accreditation should be carried out we were familiar with the experiences of others. We could look to what has been done in the secondary schools and in higher education. We were familiar with what had been done in other regional associations. It was apparent to us that we could collect data on a school; that we could count its books and measure the space per child, could read the credentials of its staff, study the budget, review the course outlines, analyze test results, even ask the parents and citizens to comment upon the school.

But somehow there seemed to be a missing element. Given all that data and more, would there be some assurance that the educational effort was effective, that it would be a continuously improving effort?

We were helped by NSSE as we selected their criteria to guide the self-study. We have also allowed for variations in the criteria to be used in an effort to assure ourselves that effectiveness would be demonstrated. More than that we wanted to be sure to include broader goals and objectives. We were particularly concerned about the affective dimensions of the school, the child/teacher relationship, the school/community relationship, and the nature of that environment, atmosphere we felt was extremely significant.

We also wanted to be sure that the school was responsive to the concerns of parents, even if that meant helping parents to be more realistic about their expectations.

As we move through five steps from candidacy to accreditation we believe that we can demonstrate that these steps do result in action, and the action plan developed by those closest to us and implemented by them is one of the most significant pieces of the process.

This took long hours of deliberation, and I guess there was a sense of satisfaction when we were able to put out some publications which indicated the way in which a school might move through these steps. But even at that, once the process of achieving accreditation for elementary schools had been developed other concerns began to surface.

A major consideration in the selection of criteria and procedures had been the desire to assure each school of the opportunity, first, to describe, then, second, to preserve, and, finally, to enhance its own uniqueness. We surely were not looking to pour all schools into a mold which satisfied our expectations, and this was a difficult task. We wanted to be sure we were going the right way.

And I guess that brings us to the theme of this conference which I suspect we had in our thoughts before it became the byword: outcomes assessment.

This concept I think has some very strong potential, but also its own limitations. How easy it would be to be concerned with only those outcomes which could be subjected to standardized tests, which could be easily measured and quantified, and which conform readily to computerized analysis.

There is a very seductive appeal to such a model, but what of the truly significant outcomes, many less or not at all amenable to such techniques? It's important for us to remember that the outcomes orientation is rooted in an industrial model concerned with product analysis and program budgeting. That should immediately alert us to the dangers.

The deeper roots of our assessment are in systems analysis resulting from social and economic pressures. Output objectives are often descriptive and predictive as goods or services or programs, but educational outputs can only be conceived as multiple outputs less susceptible to specific descriptors.

It's an inescapable fact that every school is subject to evaluation constantly. Judging, contrasting, comparing, assessing occur regularly among parents and citizens, and everyone is an expert. Professionals and students add their voices. Thus it behooves us to remain sensitive to purposes and the broad spectrum of resources.

In an effort to lure schools away from the temptation to shape themselves to the dimensions of standardized tests, assessment and evaluation must be as diverse as the outcomes sought and/or available.

Unfortunately the result of some of this outcomes assessment and its parallel accountability has resulted in a back-to-basic rush. The problem is there has often been little or no thought as to what is truly basic. Essential agreement among us might be reached that communication skills are important and to be widely supported, but should not reading, writing, listening, speaking possibly be joined by visual interpretation, computer analysis? And may it not be even more important, more basic to require a variety of ways of knowing, interpreting, organizing, processing, with the ultimate outcome a value system that undergirds all decision-making?

And what are we going to do about creativity, interpersonal relationships, multicultural understanding? Once a school has established its basics, how do we know whether or not it will be effective in achieving them?

In the past decade a somewhat different approach was used in an attempt to determine what factors account for the differences between schools which are identified as effective and those which are identified as not effective. We can in an informal way think of effective schools in our experience. However, it is difficult for us to determine how we reach that decision.

Some of the research began with the Coleman study, which was commissioned by the Department of Justice as part of the whole integration effort. The results of that study fortunately did indicate that schooling is more effective than no schooling if you compared children who go to school and children who do not. Prince Edward County in Virginia provided the setting for that comparison.

However, it is difficult beyond that to identify school-related variables which account for the differences among schools. You will remember the early first grade reading study in which we were going to find out what was the best way to teach reading, and the efforts out of that indicated clearly that there was much more difference among schools using the same techniques than there were differences between approaches.

The Rand Corporation study confirmed that research has not identified a variant of a school system that is consistently related to educational outcomes.

There are a couple of relevant factors and there are factors over which we have little or no control. One of them is the quality of the student's home life and the other is the quality of the community in which the school is located. It is difficult to be responsible for outcomes when you do not have control of the elements which contribute to them.

Klitz and Hall studied what they called overachieving schools. They looked at schools that did well on the indices which have been commonly used, and, again, no one factor was isolated as accounting for the exceptionality of the schools. But there were two common elements:

One was a principal of unusual ability, unusual ability characterized as having "expert power" — compared with just authority or management power. The second one was high expectations on the part of the principal and the teachers for the children in that school.

The climate created by these two factors was identified as existing or potentially existing in almost any situation regardless of socioeconomic or other factors.

I cite these examples because I think it led us to some extent to take one more step in trying to meet the needs of all of the schools that might be interested in accreditation. We wanted every school to be able to represent its effectiveness, and therefore we decided to look at the three subgroups: public schools, church-related schools, and independent schools.

Through the efforts of three committees we asked them to look at the criteria and the process and to make whatever recommendations and suggestions would make these more meaningful. This was based on the fact that there is a special mission often inherent in the three kinds of schools. Certainly there are sources of authority and means of support as well as a different concept of community.

Necessary adjustments, additions, deletions, substitutions, elaborations were recommended, but this led us into some dangerous areas, too, because it remained important for us to focus our attention on the truly significant outcomes that must be common to all schools. The critical concern for the three major categories of schools is balanced by a need to assure each school of the opportunity to present itself individually, and so in the final analysis uniqueness and diversity must merge in a fundamental emphasis and unity of purpose: the quality of education of every elementary school learner.

We have a long way to go and I would urge us to keep our minds on the fundamental basic with which we are concerned and to that end I would like to share with you a story and dedicate it to Scott Cunningham.

I think we can now identify with the ship's captain who first thing every morning opened the ship's safe, took out an old creased paper, and read it intently, and then carefully replaced it. One day he was called suddenly to the bridge in the middle of this ritual and the ship's officers, who had been burning with curiosity, got a chance to steal a look at that piece of paper. On it was written "Port-left-red" and "Starboard-right-green."

And so may we regain our elemental bearings! It will ever be important to make sure that we know where we want to be going in hopes that we may then find the way to get there, and perhaps even leave a path for those who come after us.

**THE MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION
OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS**

May 27, 1966; May 28, 1976

**THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**

**ABSOLUTE CHARTER OF
THE MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION
OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS★**

This instrument witnesseth that the Board of Regents for and on behalf of the Education Department of the State of New York has granted this absolute charter

1. Incorporating Robert L. Amsden, Irene M. Davis, Calvert N. Ellis, Elwood C. Kastner, Albert E. Meder, Jr., Oliver W. Melchoir, Albert I. Oliver, Joseph J. Tarallo, K. Roald Bergethon, Justin E. Diny, Daniel Z. Gibson, John P. Lozo, J. Folwell Scull, Jr., Mary H. Carter, Wilson H. Elkins, Martin D. Jenkins, Charles Martin, Margaret Claydon (known in religion as Sister Margaret), and Wilfred J. Nash, and their associates and successors as an educational corporation under the corporate name of The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, to be located in the city, county and State of New York.
2. The purposes for which such corporation is to be formed, are to take over, carry on, and continue the affairs, property, obligations, contracts, and activities of the unincorporated association known as the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and to pursue the general objectives of that association, to wit, to encourage the achievement of higher quality and to facilitate the development of better working relations among the higher institutions, secondary schools, and other educational agencies in the Middle States. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the purposes of the corporation include:
 - a. To accredit institutions of higher education and of secondary education located within the Middle States area (the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia) as well as those located outside of the continental United States as provided for in the bylaws of the corporation. It is understood that the process of evaluation and accreditation is itself intended to foster the development of a climate which will be a positive force in realizing the general purpose of the association as stated above;
 - b. To initiate and sustain such research as may be consistent with the general purpose of the association; and

- c. To provide an aegis under which representatives of secondary schools, institutions of higher education, and other education organizations may meet in the discussion of educational problems and in the common pursuit of solutions to these problems.
3. The persons named as incorporators shall constitute the first board of trustees. The board shall have power to adopt bylaws, including therein, provisions fixing the method of election and the term of office of trustees, and shall have power also, by vote of two-thirds of all the members of the board of trustees, to change the number of trustees, to be not more than 25 nor less than 5.
4. The corporation thereby created shall be a nonstock corporation organized and operated exclusively for educational purposes, and no part of its earnings or net income shall inure to the benefit of any individual, and no officer, member, or employee of the corporation shall receive or be entitled to receive any pecuniary profit from the operations thereof; except reasonable compensation for services.
5. The principal office of the corporation is to be located in the city, county and State of New York.
6. The Commissioner of Education is designated as the representative of the corporation upon whom process in any action or proceeding against it may be served.

GRANTED May 27, 1966, by the Board of Regents for and on behalf of the State Education Department, executed under the seal of said Department and recorded therein. Number 9137

Edgar, W. Couper (signed)

James E. Allen, Jr. (signed)

Chancellor

President of the University
and Commissioner of Education

- ★ Amendment to Charter granted May 28, 1976 by the Board of Regents changing the name of the Corporation to the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.

*THE MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION
OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS*

(Revised December 8, 1976)

ARTICLE I: POWERS AND PURPOSES

The Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as the "Association"), shall have such powers as are now or may be hereafter granted to corporations incorporated under the Education Law by the Regents of The University of the State of New York not inconsistent with the purposes set forth in the Charter of the Association.

The Association is a non-governmental, voluntary association of educational institutions in the Middle States area of the United States. The purposes of the Association are to encourage, advance, assist, and preserve the achievement of quality education in the Middle States area of the United States, in the public interest and in cooperation with all interested Federal, State, and private educational organizations, agencies, and institutions. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, these purposes shall be effected by:

- a. Evaluating and accrediting educational institutions within the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland; the District of Columbia; the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone and the Virgin Islands; and in other areas outside the continental United States in the case of institutions which may be related to institutions within the Middle States area or which may request accreditation by the Association.
- b. Through the process of evaluation and accreditation, assisting member institutions in carrying out and improving the particular educational goals of each such institution.
- c. Advancing the public interest in education in the Middle States area of the United States by cooperating with public and private agencies and organizations with responsibility in the field of education.
- d. Facilitating and articulating the development of better relations between educational institutions and other governmental and private educational agencies within the Middle States area of the United States.
- e. Initiating and sustaining such research as may be consistent with the purpose of this Association.
- f. Defining, to the extent appropriate, a basic minimum level of educational effectiveness applicable to specific types of educational institutions.

- g. Cooperating with other types of educational institutions within the Middle States area of the United States, to the end that the entire educational effort within the area shall be maintained and improved.
- h. Organizing and encouraging the discussion and examination of educational problems by representatives of educational institutions and of public and private educational agencies.
- i. Encouraging and promoting the common pursuit of solutions to educational problems throughout the United States, through its individual and organizational members and other public and educational agencies.
- j. Speaking for the membership in appropriate private and public forums with respect to educational problems, without in any manner restricting the right of each institutional or organizational member of the Association to represent its own views in such forums.

ARTICLE II: CONSTITUENCY

The constituency of the Association shall consist of educational institutions located in the States of Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania; the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands. Educational institutions located outside the continental United States may be received into membership upon accreditation by the appropriate Commission of the Association, subject to approval of such membership by the Board of Trustees with respect to the geographical location of any such institutions outside the continental United States.

ARTICLE III: MEMBERSHIP

Section I: General

The membership of the Association shall consist of three categories:

- a. Institutional membership
- b. Organizational membership, and
- c. Honorary membership.

Only officially designated representatives of institutional members are eligible to vote at official meetings of the Association, although all representatives of any member may have the privilege of the floor.

The Association shall establish and maintain all regulations and conditions governing membership in the Association; however, there shall be no discrimination as to religion, race, or sex in according membership in, or the privileges of, the Association.

Decisions by the Association on questions not pertaining to its own membership or organization shall always be considered advisory, and

not mandatory, each institution preserving its own individuality and liberty of action upon all other subjects considered.

Membership of an institutional member shall cease whenever such member withdraws or is removed by the Board of Trustees from the accredited list upon recommendation of the appropriate Commission in accordance with Article IX of these By-Laws or for failure to pay the annual dues for two successive years. Membership of an organizational member shall cease whenever such member withdraws or is removed from membership by the Board of Trustees for cause or for failure to pay the annual dues of the Association for two successive years.

Section 2: Institutional Membership

Any educational institution accredited by a Commission or any unit of an educational institution which has been separately accredited by a Commission will be received into membership of the Association upon payment of the annual membership dues, provided such institution meets the following minimum standards:

- a. The institution has a charter and/or formal authority from the appropriate governmental agency to award, in the case of institutions of higher education, a degree, and in the case of institutions of secondary education, a diploma representing satisfactory completion of secondary education.
- b. The institution has a governing board which includes a membership broadly representative of the public interest.
- c. The institution devotes all, or substantially all, of its gross income to the pursuit of its educational purposes and programs.

Section 3: Organizational Membership

Organizational membership may be granted by action of the Board of Trustees to:

- a. The office of any state or local department of public education or any system of church related or sponsored schools or independent schools in the geographical area served by the Association.
- b. Any educational association, organization, or agency whose membership is primarily from within the geographical area served by the Association and whose membership will, in the judgement of the Board of Trustees, assist the Association in achieving its objectives.

Section 4: Honorary Membership

The Board of Trustees may elect as honorary members individuals whose special qualifications or service to the Association merit this distinction. Honorary members shall receive appropriate publications of the Association and may attend any annual or special meeting of the Association. Honorary members shall not vote or pay membership dues.

ARTICLE IV: MEETINGS

Section 1: Annual Meeting

An Annual Meeting of the Association shall be held for the discussion of problems pertinent to the purposes of the Association, the election of officers, and the transaction of such business as may come before the Association.

Honorary members and individuals officially connected with educational institutions or organizations holding membership in the Association are especially invited to attend this meeting, and all members of the educational community are invited to participate in the open sessions.

Section 2: Special Meetings

The Board of Trustees is empowered to call special meetings of the Association when the occasion demands, upon written notice which shall state the purpose or purposes of the meeting.

Section 3: Place of Meetings

The Board of Trustees shall, unless the Association itself has determined them, fix the date and place of the Annual Meeting of the Association.

The location and time of any special meeting shall be fixed by the Board of Trustees.

Section 4: Notice of Meetings

Notice of the Annual Meeting, or any special meeting, shall be sent to members at least six weeks, or one month, respectively, prior to such meeting.

Section 5: Resolutions

Resolutions for consideration at the Annual Meeting on matters not involving amendments to the By-Laws or Charter (Article XVI) must be submitted to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees through the Executive Director at least thirty days prior to the meeting. However, the membership, present and voting at any annual or special meeting, may decide by majority vote of a quorum to consider any resolution presented from the floor.

ARTICLE V: VOTING

Each accredited member institution shall have one vote on matters before the Association, and this vote shall be cast by an officially designated representative.

Voting representatives of one-fourth of the institutional members of the Association shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

Except where otherwise required by applicable New York Law or these By-Laws, action by the Association at a meeting thereof shall be taken by the affirmative vote of a majority of voting representatives constituting a quorum.

Upon authorization by the Board of Trustees or its Executive Committee, the Association may act, by mail ballot, by the affirmative vote of an absolute majority of the institutional members by such ballot.

ARTICLE VI: BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Section 1: Powers and Responsibilities

The affairs of the Association shall be managed by its Board of Trustees, subject, however, to the authority of the institutional members at a meeting to initiate or amend any action or policy of the Association. The Board of Trustees shall have the power to act for the Association in intervals between meetings of the members, including the right to exercise any power granted to the Association by the Charter or by the By-Laws.

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing powers, the Board of Trustees shall have authority to:

- a. Approve the program and agenda and, unless otherwise determined by the Association, fix the time, place and business of the Annual Meeting.
- b. Act for the Association during intervals between meetings of the Association.
- c. Call special meetings of the Association.
- d. Provide for an annual audit of the Association accounts by an outside independent auditor.
- e. Review and approve the annual budget of the Association and any changes thereto, oversee the collection of revenues and the expenditure of funds by the Association, and fix the dues for membership and the fees charged for the educational services rendered by the Association and its Commissions.
- f. Appoint and fix the salary of the Executive Director of the Association.
- g. Review and approve the appointment and salaries of the Executive Director of each Commission and of the professional staffs of each Commission and the Association.
- h. Review and approve:
 - 1) the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting, the list of accredited members, as well as other appropriate publications of

the Association and its Commissions and
2) publicity to the media by the Association and its Commissions.

- i. Annually review the operating procedures and performance of each Commission and the Association.
- j. Initiate, implement, and supervise policies and programs of the Association designed to improve articulation between schools and institutions of higher education.
- k. Initiate, implement, and supervise policies and programs of the Association designed to improve and advance education in schools and institutions of higher education.
- l. Take all reasonable and necessary steps to advance and improve education within the Middle States constituency and throughout the United States.

Section 2: Number, Election and Terms of Office

The number of the Board of Trustees shall be no fewer than twenty-one nor more than twenty-five.

The Board of Trustees shall consist of the President, First and Second Vice Presidents, the Immediate Past President, and Treasurer; the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson or First Vice Chairperson of the Commissions, and no fewer than twelve nor more than sixteen other elected members chosen at large by the Association. Board membership shall include at least one trustee from each of the following areas: Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania and the Caribbean area provided also that at least three trustees are from member institutions of higher education, three from member schools and three who do not hold currently professional positions in education and who are broadly representative of the public interest. The elected members of the Board, with the exception of the officers, shall serve terms of office of three years renewable for one additional term of three years. The President of the Association shall serve as Chairperson of the Board of Trustees.

There shall be at least two meetings annually of the Board of Trustees. The time and place of the next meeting will be determined at each meeting of the Board of Trustees. Notice shall be sent by the Executive Director at least four weeks in advance of such meetings.

At all meetings of the Board of Trustees the presence of a majority of the entire number of Trustees shall be necessary to constitute a quorum and to be sufficient for the transaction of business; and any act of a majority present at a meeting at which there is a quorum shall be the act of the Board of Trustees, except as may be otherwise required by the Charter or these By-Laws. If a quorum shall not be present at any meeting of the Trustees, the Trustees present may reschedule the meeting.

If any Trustee shall fail to attend three consecutive meetings of the Board of Trustees, he shall be deemed to have resigned, and the vacancy thereby created shall be filled by the Board.

Section 3: Executive Committee

The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees shall consist of the five elected officers of the Association, the Chairpersons of the Commissions and two other Trustees, elected annually, with each Commission having the opportunity to nominate one of these two trustees.

The Executive Committee shall exercise the functions of the Board of Trustees between meetings thereof, and shall supervise the administrative and financial affairs of the Association.

The Executive Committee shall meet as frequently as may be required to carry out its responsibility.

The Executive Directors of the Association and the Commissions shall be available to advise and meet with the Executive Committee and shall keep the Committee fully and currently informed of the affairs of the Association and its Commissions.

ARTICLE VII: OFFICERS AND STAFF

Section 1: Officers

The officers of the Association shall be a President, the Immediate Past President, a First Vice President, a Second Vice President, and a Treasurer. Officers, Trustees, and Commissioners shall be elected by a majority vote of the membership present and voting at the Annual Meeting of the Association. The President, Past President, and Vice Presidents shall serve one-year terms of office. The Treasurer may be re-elected for such number of terms as will not exceed four continuous years in that office. The First Vice President shall succeed to the office of the President, and the Second Vice President shall succeed to the office of First Vice President. The Second Vice President shall be elected in alternate years from the higher education constituency and the secondary education constituency.

A vacancy in any elective office may be filled by the Board of Trustees for the unexpired portion of the term ending at the next annual meeting of the Association, at which time the individual appointed to such a vacancy may be elected for a regular term of office. All elected officers of the Association, the members of the Board of Trustees, and Committee and Commission members continue to serve in the office until the conclusion of the Annual Meeting or until their respective successors shall assume office, whichever is later.

The President of the Association shall:

- a. Preside at the meetings of the Association and chair meetings of the Board of Trustees of the Association.
- b. Appoint such special committees as may be authorized by the Board of Trustees.

- c. Appoint the Program Committee for the Annual Meeting and assume responsibility for the program and speakers, based on the guidance and suggestions of the Board of Trustees.
- d. Perform other duties usually prescribed for the office of the President.

The First Vice President shall:

- a. Perform, in the event of absence, the duties of the President and such duties as may be assigned by the President.
- b. Become familiar with the work of the Commissions.

The Second Vice President shall:

- a. Perform, in the event of absence, the duties of the First Vice President and such duties as may be assigned by the President.
- b. Become familiar with the work of the Commissions.

The Treasurer shall, through the office of the Executive Director of the Association and subject to the approval and advice of the Finance Committee:

- a. Be responsible for the financial affairs of the Association and for having the Board of Trustees and Executive Committee fully and currently informed with respect thereto.
- b. Collect and pay out Funds of the Association as directed by the Board of Trustees or its Executive Committee.
- c. Prepare and submit a financial report to be presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association.
- d. Prepare and submit to the Board of Trustees, with the approval of the Finance Committee, a budget for each fiscal year of the Association.
- e. Recommend to the Board of Trustees, with the approval of the Finance Committee, any revision to the Budget to meet unanticipated expenditures of the Association and any decrease in the reserve funds of the Association to meet such expenditures.
- f. Prepare and submit to the Board of Trustees, with the approval of the Finance Committee, a schedule of membership dues of the Association and of fees for educational services provided by the Association and each Commission.
- g. Be available for consultation to the Commissions on matters involving Association finances.

Section 2: Executive Director

The Executive Director shall be appointed by the Board of Trustees.
The Executive Director shall:

- a. Be the chief administrative officer of the Association, subject to the direction of the Board of Trustees and the Executive Committee, and serve as the agent of the Board of Trustees.
- b. Maintain the records of the Association.
- c. Receive and hold monies of the Association and pay out same on

written order of the President, Treasurer, or as otherwise directed by the Board of Trustees and in accordance with the budget.

- d. Conduct the general correspondence of the Association and of the Board of Trustees.
- e. Assist the Committee on School and College Relations, with the cooperation of the Executive Directors of the Commissions, in the development of projects for study and research.
- f. Make arrangements for the Annual Meeting of the Association and the meetings of the Board of Trustees and its Executive Committee.
- g. Prepare and distribute the publications of the Association and supervise the publicity of the Association to the media, as appropriate.
- h. Prepare for and attend all meetings of the Board of Trustees and its Executive Committee except for executive sessions thereof.

ARTICLE VIII: COMMISSIONS

Section I: General

There shall be two Commissions, the Commission on Higher Education and the Commission on Secondary Schools.

Subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, each Commission shall have the authority to:

- a. Appoint an Executive Director who shall be the chief administrative officer of the Commission, subject to the direction of the Commission and its Executive Committee, and serve as the agent of the Commission, with responsibility for, among other things,
 - (1) maintaining the records of the Commission,
 - (2) conducting the general correspondence of the Commission,
 - (3) administering the evaluation and accreditation functions of the Commission,
 - (4) assisting and coordinating the work of committees of the Commission,
 - (5) arranging and attending meetings of the Commission and its Executive Committee, except for executive sessions thereof,
 - (6) preparing and processing publications of the Commission,
 - (7) maintaining liaison with other accrediting, state, and federal agencies and organizations as may be related to the work of the Commissions, in coordination with the Board of Trustees and officers of the Association,
 - (8) acting as liaison between the Commission and the Executive Director of the Association, and

- (9) administering the budget of the Commission subject to the limitations thereof set by the Board of Trustees and the Commission.
- b. Appoint other professional staff officers and fix their compensation, duties, and terms of appointment.
 - c. Employ and contract with other persons within the limitations of the Commission's budget.
 - d. Elect annually an Executive Committee of not less than three (3) nor more than five (5) members from among the members of the Commission which shall exercise the functions of the Commission between meetings thereof and shall meet, together with the Executive Director of the Commission, as frequently as may be required to carry out this responsibility.

By delegation of authority from the Association and subject to the supervision of the Board of Trustees, the Commissions shall:

- a. By accreditation, evaluation, consultation and in all other appropriate ways, promote in the Middle States area the welfare and improvement of education with special emphasis upon service to member and candidate institutions but without limitation to these colleges, universities and schools.
- b. Publish lists of accredited and candidate educational institutions in accordance with the standards adopted by the Association.
- c. Recommend to the Association standards and changes thereto for the accreditation of educational institutions, especially such modifications as will keep the standards in harmony with those generally accepted for educational institutions and will promote consistent growth in the effectiveness of member and candidate institutions.
- d. In accordance with Association policy, cooperate in appropriate ways with similar commissions in other regional associations.
- e. Promote articulation between and among educational institutions.

Section 2: The Commission on Higher Education

The Commission on Higher Education shall consist of twenty-four persons, including the President and First and Second Vice Presidents of the Association. Members of the Commission shall be elected for three year terms at the Annual Meeting of the Association and may be re-elected for a second term. Up to three members shall be elected who do not currently hold professional positions in education and who are broadly representative of the public interest. The remaining members shall be elected with consideration to geographical and institutional distribution reflective of the Commission's constituents. Vacancies shall be filled by vote of the Association at the Annual Meeting.

The officers of the Commission on Higher Education shall be the Chairperson, First Vice Chairperson, and Second Vice Chairperson elected annually by Commission membership. Officers are eligible for

reelection up to a maximum of six years, provided they are elected to additional three year terms at the Annual Meeting of the Association, but in no case may the total length of service on the Commission exceed nine years.

Section 3: The Commission on Secondary Schools

The Commission on Secondary Schools shall consist of no fewer than eighteen or more than twenty-one persons, including the President and First and Second Vice Presidents of the Association. Members of the Commission shall be elected for three year terms at the Annual Meeting of the Association and may be reelected for a second term. Up to three members shall be elected who do not currently hold professional positions in education and who are broadly representative of the public interest. The remaining members shall be elected with consideration to geographical and institutional distribution reflective of the Commission's constituents. Vacancies shall be filled by vote of the Association at the Annual Meeting.

The officers of the Commission on Secondary Schools shall be the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson elected annually by Commission membership. Officers are eligible for reelection up to a maximum of six years, provided they are elected to additional three year terms at the Annual Meeting of the Association, but in no case may the total length of service on the Commission exceed nine years.

The Chairperson of the Commission shall appoint an advisory committee for each state and the District of Columbia under regulations recommended by the Commission and approved by the Board of Trustees. Membership on such committees may include state or local educational officials, but such membership shall not affect the voluntary, non-Governmental character of the Association, its Commissions, and any committees thereof.

ARTICLE IX: REVIEW PROCEDURES

Section 1: Statement of Purpose

These rules are designed to afford, in view of the educational nature of the subject matter and the need for application of an informed educational judgment, a fair and expeditious procedure for the processing of appeals from accreditation decisions and do not constitute a quasi-judicial procedure.

Section 2: Definitions

- a. *Accreditation Decision.* "Accreditation decision" means the action taken by each Commission in approving or rejecting any application for accreditation, refusing to accredit an application, reaffirming or withdrawing the existing accreditation of a mem-

- ber, or reducing the period during which an existing accreditation previously had been approved.
- b. *Commission.* "Commission" means either the Commission on Higher Education or the Commission on Secondary Schools.
 - c. *Applicant.* "Applicant" means either a non-member of the Association which is eligible for consideration for membership or a member of the Association which is the subject of an accreditation decision by a Commission.
 - d. *Appeals Committee and Panels.* At the commencement of each year, the President shall appoint a pool of ten (10) members of the Board of Trustees, to serve in panels of five (5) members each with respect to each appeal. The President shall appoint a panel upon receipt of any appeal from a decision of the Executive Committee of any Commission. Where an appeal is from a decision of the Executive Committee of the Commission on Higher Education at least three of the members of the Appeals Panel for that appeal shall be from the field of higher education. Where the appeal is from a decision of the Executive Committee of the Commission on Secondary Schools, at least three of the members of the Appeals Panel shall be from the field of secondary education. One or more appeals may be assigned to the Appeals Panel so appointed. The Appeals Panel so appointed shall elect its Chairperson and shall act by at least a majority of its members. Any vacancy on the Appeals Panel may be filled by the President of the Association.

Section 3: Request for Reconsideration of Accreditation Decision

- a. *Time and Form of Request.* An applicant must request reconsideration of an accreditation decision by a Commission, within thirty (30) days after receipt of the decision, by filing with the Executive Director of the Commission such a request in writing. The request shall consist of a short and plain statement of the specific grounds upon which reconsideration is requested, with the reasons for each such grounds, and any other relevant statements or documents which the applicant desires to include in its request.
- b. *Action on Request.* The Executive Committee of the Commission shall consider the request for reconsideration and, through the Executive Director of the Commission, shall communicate its action thereon in writing not more than thirty (30) days after receipt of the request. The Executive Committee may deny or grant the request or take such other action consistent with these By-Laws as may, in its sole discretion, be required in the best interest of education.
- c. *Disposition Required.* The filing and disposition of a request for reconsideration are required before the Board of Trustees or its Appeals Panel will consider an appeal from a Commission accreditation decision.

Section 4: Appeal to Appeals Panel of Board of Trustees

- a. *Time for Filing Appeal.* An appeal from a denial of a request for reconsideration of an accreditation decision of a Commission must be filed with the Executive Director of the Association within thirty (30) days from the service of the Commission Executive Committee's denial upon the applicant.
- b. *Form of Appeal.* The appeal shall consist of a short and plain written statement of the grounds upon which the applicant believes the accreditation decision to have been erroneous, together with documents relevant to these reasons. Five copies of the complete written statement must be filed with the Executive Director of the Association.
- c. *Request for Hearing.* The appeal shall state whether or not the applicant desires a hearing. The Appeals Panel shall, within twenty (20) days after receipt of the appeal, notify the applicant of its disposition of the request for hearing or its own decision to hold a hearing.
- d. *Notice of Hearing.* The Appeals Panel shall serve a notice of hearing upon the applicant not less than thirty (30) days before the commencement of such hearing or such lesser period of time as the Appeals Panel and the applicant mutually may agree in writing.
- e. *Procedure at Hearing.* The Appeals Panel and applicant may be advised and represented by such persons as each may choose. Only one representative may speak for the applicant. The course of the hearing shall be controlled by the Chairperson of the Appeals Panel, who shall determine whether or not any statement shall be taken under oath and shall rule upon all requests made during the hearing. The Chairperson may limit the testimony of witnesses, provided opportunity for the submission of a written statement in substitution therefor is afforded the witness. Reasonable questioning or cross-examination of a witness may be afforded the applicant, and the members of the Appeals Panel may ask such questions as they deem relevant.
- f. *Place and Duration of Hearing.* Unless otherwise ordered by the Appeals Panel, hearings shall be held at the headquarters of the Association and shall last no more than one day.
- g. *Record.* The hearing shall be transcribed. A copy of the transcript shall be furnished, at the reasonable cost thereof, to the applicant. The record of the hearing shall consist of the appeal filed by the applicant, the transcript of hearing, documents submitted at the hearing, and such other documents as may be filed within ten (10) days after the end of the hearing.
- h. *Decision of Appeals Panel.* The Appeals Panel shall render its decision not more than seventy (70) days after the close of the hearing, or where no hearing is held, after the notification provided in Section 4(c). The decision shall either sustain the accreditation decision of the Commission, or remand the case to

the Commission with instruction to grant the application or to make such further investigation as may be appropriate.

Section 5: Review of Appeals Panel Decision by The Board of Trustees

- a. *Time of Request.* An applicant or the Commission may request review of the decision of the Appeals Panel by the Board of Trustees. Such request to the Executive Director of the Association shall be made within twenty (20) days after service of the decision of the Appeals Panel upon the applicant or Commission.
- b. *Form of Request.* The request for review shall consist of a short and plain written statement of the reasons therefor, together with references to the hearing record in support thereof. Twenty (20) copies of such request shall be filed. Upon receipt of the request, the Executive Director shall forthwith forward copies of the request to each member of the Board of Trustees, at his or her official address in the United States as shown by the records of the Association.
- c. *Action on Request.* A request for review of a decision of the Appeals Panel shall only be granted upon the affirmative vote of a majority of the full Board of Trustees, excluding the members of the Appeals Panel.
- d. *Denial of Request.* If no such affirmative vote is obtained, then the Executive Director of the Association shall inform the applicant and Commission in writing that the request has been denied, with a short statement of the reasons therefor.
- e. *Board Consideration.* If the request for review is granted, the Executive Director of the Association shall so inform the applicant and Commission, which shall within twenty (20) days thereafter, submit twenty (20) copies of any further statement or documents desired to be considered by the Board of Trustees. The request shall be considered by the Board of Trustees at its next meeting. At such meetings, representatives of the applicant or Commission may appear and present such relevant argument, lasting no more than one hour in total, as they may desire. The members of the Appeals Panel shall not be present or participate in the deliberations of the Board concerning the request.
- f. *Board Action.* Thereupon, the Board of Trustees, by majority vote of all its members excluding the Appeals Panel, shall deny the request, grant the request, or refer the matter to the Commission which made the accreditation decision to make such further investigation as may be appropriate.
- g. *Notification of Board Action.* The Executive Director of the Association shall communicate in writing the decision of the Board of Trustees to the applicant and Commission.

Section 6: Miscellaneous

- a. *Computation of Time.* In computing any period of time prescribed or allowed by this Article of the By-Laws, the day of the act or event from which the designated period of time begins to run shall not be included. The last day of the period so computed shall be included, unless it is a Saturday, a Sunday, or a legal holiday, in which event the period runs until the end of the next day which is not a Saturday, a Sunday, or a legal holiday.
- b. *Enlargement of Time.* When by these rules an act is required to be done at or within a specified period of time, the Executive Committee or the Commission, Appeals Panel of the Board of Trustees, or Board of Trustees, for good cause shown in writing at least five (5) days prior to the expiration of such period of time, may enlarge such period of time.
- c. *Other Procedures.* With respect to a specific accreditation decision and the review or appeal thereof, the Executive Committee of the Commission, the Appeals Panel of the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Trustees may adopt other procedures not inconsistent with this Article IX and other provisions of these By-Laws.
- d. *Service or Filing of Document.* The service or filing of any document required or permitted by this Article of the By-Laws shall be effected by hand delivering such document to the person or office involved or by the use of certified or registered mail, return receipt requested. Any time period provided by these rules shall commence from such delivery or the receipt of such mail.

ARTICLE X: COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION

Section 1: General

There shall be three designated committees of the Association: The Nominating Committee, the Finance Committee, and the Committee on School and College Relations. Committees as specified in these By-Laws or authorized by the Board of Trustees shall be appointed by the President.

Section 2: Nominating Committee

The President shall appoint a Nominating Committee for the purpose of nominating qualified persons for election to the offices of the Association and Commissions. The Nominating Committee shall consist of five (5) members, with the Immediate Past President as Chairperson.

If the Immediate Past President is unable to serve, the President, shall appoint a chairperson from among those members of the Board of Trustees who are not eligible for re-election.

Two members, one from each Commission who is not eligible for

re-election, and two other members, so chosen as to provide appropriate representation of the Association's constituency, shall form the remainder of the Committee.

The Nominating Committee shall report to the President no later than thirty days prior to the Annual Meeting of the Association. Nominations, in addition to those by the Committee, may be received from the floor at the Annual Meeting.

Section 3: Finance Committee

The Finance Committee shall consist of the Treasurer, as Chairperson; four members representing the interests of the Board of Trustees, and two other members representing the interests of the Commissions.

The Committee shall advise the Treasurer with respect to the financial, budgetary, and related matters and shall carry out such other duties as may be assigned to it by the Board of Trustees, the President, or the Treasurer.

Section 4: Committee on School and College Relations

The Committee on School and College Relations shall consist of fifteen (15) members appointed by the President from the elected members of the Board of Trustees, the elected members of the Commissions, the student body, faculty or administration of member institutions, other educational organizations and associations, or the general public. Appointment shall be for a three-year term. No committee member shall serve continuously for more than two three-year terms.

The Committee shall continuously study and advise the Board of Trustees with respect to articulation between secondary schools and colleges and other areas of joint concern to schools and colleges. The Committee shall also advise the Board on study and research to be undertaken or directed by the Association.

The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Committee shall be appointed by the President from the membership of the Committee.

The Executive Director of each Commission shall serve as an *ex officio* member of the Committee on School and College Relations.

ARTICLE XI: BOOKS AND RECORDS

The Association shall keep correct and complete books and records of accounts and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of the Association, the Board of Trustees, and the Committees and Commissions thereof. It shall keep at the principal office of the Association a record of the names and addresses of those member institutions entitled to vote and of the administrative heads of such institutions.

Subject to lawful court order or by decision by the Board of Trustees or Executive Committee the records of any Commission relating to the evaluation or accreditation of any present, prospective, or

former institutional member of the Association shall be confidential and shall not be disclosed outside the Association without the prior written consent of the governing authority of the institution concerned or where such disclosure would impair the confidentiality and effectiveness of the evaluation and accreditation process.

ARTICLE XII: CONTRACTS, CHECKS, FUNDS AND GIFTS

Section 1: Contracts

The Board of Trustees may authorize any officer or officers, agent or agents, of the Association or its Commissions to enter into any contract or execute and deliver any instrument in the name of and on behalf of the Association or its Commissions.

Section 2: Checks, Drafts, Etc.

All checks, drafts, or other orders for the payment of money, notes or other evidence of indebtedness, issued in the name of the Association, shall be signed by such officers, agent or agents, of the Association and in such manner as shall be determined by the Board of Trustees. In the absence of such determination by the Board of Trustees, such instrument shall be signed by the Treasurer and countersigned by the President of the Association.

Section 3: Funds

All funds of the Association shall be deposited to the credit of the Association in such banks, trust companies, or other depositories as the Board of Trustees may select.

Section 4: Gifts

The Association shall keep correct and complete books and records of gifts, grants, bequests, or devices for general purposes or for any special purpose of the Association. No such gift, grant, bequest, or device shall be received by the Association except upon the approval thereof by the Board of Trustees.

ARTICLE XIII: DUES AND FEES

The Board of Trustees, subject to the approval of the Association, shall determine from time to time the schedule of annual dues which shall be paid by each member institution or organization. Fees for services offered by the Association shall be set by the Board, and fees for evaluations and other services offered by the Commissions shall be set

by the Commissions subject to review by the Board on recommendation of the Finance Committee.

ARTICLE XIV: FISCAL YEAR

The fiscal year of the Association shall begin on the first of July of each year and end on the thirtieth day of June next succeeding.

ARTICLE XV: ASSETS OF THE ASSOCIATION

In the event of the dissolution of the Association, all assets thereof shall be distributed to another non-profit association or associations whose aims are compatible with those of the Association. Such selection is to be made by majority vote of the Board of Trustees.

ARTICLE XVI: AMENDMENTS

The Association shall have the power to petition the Regents of The University of the State of New York for amendment of its Charter by two-thirds vote at any meeting of the institutional members at which a quorum is present.

The By-Laws of the Association may be adopted, amended, or rescinded by majority vote at any meeting of the members at which a quorum is present.

In all instances involving amendments to the Charter or By-Laws, notice of the proposed action must accompany the call to the meeting. Such notice must be sent to the membership at least thirty days prior to the meeting. Any voting representative, officer, or trustee may propose an amendment to the Charter or By-Laws not less than thirty days before the meeting of the members at which it is requested that the amendment be considered.

ARTICLE XVII: PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES

Except as an insubstantial part of its activities, the Association is prohibited from carrying on propaganda, attempting to influence legislation, and participating in or intervening in any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office. This prohibition of political activities includes the publishing or distributing of statements on behalf of any candidate.